DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 165 638 HE 010 903

AUTHOR Koon, Jeff, Comp.
TITLE An Academic Review Using Comparative Student Evaluations of Selected Humanities Departments at Berkeley.
INSTITUTION California Univ., Berkeley.
PUB DATE [78]
NOTE 39p.; For related document, see HE 010 904; Some tables may not reproduce well ; Report prepared by the Office of Academic Affairs

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS College Environment; *College Majors; College Students; *Course Evaluation; Departments; Higher Education; *Humanities; Institutional Research; Needs Assessment; *Participant Satisfaction; Program Evaluation; Questionnaires; Research Projects; State Universities; Statistical Data; Student College Relationship; *Student Evaluation of Teacher Performance; *Student Opinion; Student Participation; Student Teacher Relationship; Teacher Evaluation; *Undergraduate Students
IDENTIFIERS *California University Berkeley

ABSTRACT

Upper division undergraduate students at the University of California at Berkeley were surveyed to obtain evaluations of selected humanities departments. Of 1,472 questionnaires mailed out, 798 were returned. The questionnaire dealt with such matters as general education requirements, the quality of lower division education, extent of student contact with faculty, advising, coursework, overall student satisfaction and impact of the educational process, and students' views on various educational and university policy questions. Questions about curricula concerned the structure of the major, coverage of content, interpretation of content, class size, scheduling, competition, workload, grading, and testing. Questions about the faculty concerned their ethnicity and sex, informal relations with students, and the faculty's receptivity to males, females, whites, and minorities. A large majority of the students agreed that their program should facilitate undergraduate organization by including students on most committees, providing office space, and by similar types of inclusion. Lectures and coursework in most of the majors were evaluated as being interesting and challenging by very large majorities, but faculty receptivity to student input on course structure and content was not very high. Information and advising staff were seen as "generally quite helpful." Recommendations and information on demographic characteristics of respondents are presented. (SW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED165638

SCOPE OF INTEREST NOTICE
The ERIC Facility has assigned this document for processing to: HE 50
In our judgement, this document is also of interest to the clearinghouses noted to the right. Indexing should reflect their special points of view.

An Academic Review Using Comparative Student Evaluations of

SELECTED HUMANITIES DEPARTMENTS AT BERKELEY

MUSIC
ART
ART HISTORY
HISTORY
MISC. HUMANITIES
FRENCH
GERMAN
SPANISH
TOTAL HUMANITIES

with

Misc. Soc. Sci.
Life/Pre-Health Sci.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Associated Students
Univ of Calif
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND THE ERIC SYSTEM CONTRACTORS."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Academic Review Unit (ARU)
Academic Affairs Office
Associated Students
208 Eshleman Hall
University of California
Berkeley, CA. 94720
415-642-0256

compiled by
Jeff Koon,
Academic Review Unit Coordinator

HE 010 903

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This review would not have been possible without the support of the many students who responded to the Academic Review Unit (ARU) questionnaire.

The work of the two ARU research assistants, Andy Hanami and Carol Brewer, as well as a number of volunteers, was vital to the successful completion of the medium-scale survey evaluation project which provided the data for this review. The project involved students in more than 25 programs and departments. Over 1500 questionnaires were sent out; over 800 were returned. Data obtained here will enable the ARU to demonstrate the value and necessity in academic review processes for the collection and comparative use, across departments and programs, of student evaluations of their programs.

Funding

Funding for this work* is provided on contract by the Vice Chancellor's Office, after consultation with the Divisional Council on Educational Development, with money provided by the State Legislature, initially on request of the U. C. Student Lobby (Student Body Presidents' Council), for improvement, innovation, and evaluation in undergraduate education, or "Undergraduate Teaching Excellence."

*See also the 1976-77 ARU reports on the pre-health sciences, 14 programs in the life-related sciences, the undergraduate Spanish major, and the History of Art Department (graduate and undergraduate).

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Summary of Findings 1
Recommendations 4
Description of Samples 7
The Interpretation of the Questionnaire Data 12

Findings
- Curriculum 14
- Teaching 18
- Faculty 19
- Information and Advising Systems 20
- Student Participation 21
- Overall Satisfaction 22
- Students' Goals and the Program's Contribution Thereto 23

SELECTED HUMANITIES PROGRAMS — SUMMARY OF FINDINGS[a]

CURRICULUM

Structure of the Major. According to the students surveyed, there were very few unnecessary or artificial prerequisites to the majors, and an excessive number of required courses for the major was rare.** However, there is a shortage of curricular options in which to major in a number of programs.**

Coverage of Content. The lack of advanced courses in all areas of student interest was a problem for a majority of students in several departments.** Coursework for the major was well-integrated from course to course* and there was little classtime wasted on students with insufficient background preparation. Fieldwork-related offerings (or credit for appropriate volunteer work), and courses providing experience in real problem-solving and analysis* were not an applicable concept to many humanities majors, but where deemed relevant they were often not available or not adequate. Where equipment, supplies or media materials were most needed, shortages appeared to have a greater impact than in the sciences.**

Interpretation of Content. Although faculty were seen as a little more likely than not to show enough concern about social issues in teaching their subjects,** courses exploring the contributions of nondominant schools of thought were often not available** and methodology courses, where they could be said to exist, were as likely as not to be seen as up-to-date.**

Class Size, Scheduling. With few exceptions, large lecture classes were not seen as providing adequate learning opportunities,** and small seminars were more generally available than in other fields.** Scheduling or the actual availability of courses resulted in problems for more of the students than not.

Competition, Workload, Grading, Testing. The humanities students were evenly split as to whether competition was an aid or hindrance to their learning, and there were large differences of opinion within most programs. Faculty apparently aren't very clear about what their courses will cover or what students need to know or do to get an "A" grade, but tests in most courses are believed by students to have measured their knowledge fairly accurately.* Most students saw grading as more rigorous and workload as heavier** in their own program.

TEACHING

Lectures and coursework in most of the majors were evaluated as being interesting and challenging by very large majorities.** Faculty receptivity to student input on course structure and content wasn't very high.** T.A.s

---

[a]The choice of words in this summary is based on three response categories: agree, in between, and disagree. (See "Reporting the Data.")

*/**See text and tables for differences between program ratings. (* = differences are significant at or below .05 probability; ** = at or below .01.)

and readers were regarded fairly positively by most respondents.* Comments or review of papers, exams, etc. were regarded as thorough enough by most, and as better than in the life-related or social sciences.

Learning. A solid majority agreed that they would remember for a long time to come what they had learned in their program's courses** and students were fairly impressed with the caliber and motivation of their fellow majors.**

FACULTY

Sex and Ethnicity. In only one program did students view the number of women faculty as sufficient. A shortage of ethnic minority faculty was even more obvious across the board.

Informal Relations with Students. Only a plurality of students disagreed that their faculty aren't really interested in or concerned about undergraduates,** or agreed that communication between faculty and students is "open and fairly extensive."** Further explanation or extra instruction in the subject matter, or a referral to help, was usually easy to obtain. Faculty acquaintance with students or their work was enough so that a majority of students could get a good letter of recommendation (and the humanities students were better off than those from other subject areas in this regard).

Receptivity to Males, Females, Whites, Minorities. Although at least one department should give close attention to this area, a very large majority of the students perceived no greater support and receptivity by faculty for male versus female students,* or for white versus minority students.**

INFORMATION AND ADVISING SYSTEMS

Program office staff were seen as "generally quite helpful" throughout the sample.**

Orientation for students new to the major was not particularly effective. Advising information was seen by a plurality of the students as making it easy to choose courses and professors.* Information about graduate or professional schools was seen as insufficient by an equal plurality. And a substantial majority of the respondents felt there was not enough information about career opportunities for Bachelor's degree recipients in their program.*

Choice of Faculty Advisors. An overwhelming majority of the humanities students felt that it would be (or is) valuable to have a regular faculty advisor of their choice, and a very large majority disagreed that they had a faculty advisor of choice.**

STUDENT PARTICIPATION

A rather large majority of the students surveyed agreed that their program should facilitate undergraduate organization by including students on most committees, providing office space, allowing a quarterly mailing, etc. Well over half had been notified of a meeting of a general undergraduate organization.** Only a modest number of students responding had in any real way been active or consulted for student input by their program* and considerably fewer claimed any real knowledge about decision-making processes,

policies or program governance. A plurality of the respondents did not trust the faculty to take student needs and views into account in their decision-making for the program.

Teaching Evaluation. Students reported that a form for student evaluation of teaching was distributed in a very large majority of their classes,** but the kind of unanimity reached in the life-related sciences sample was not attained in the humanities (or social sciences). The humanities respondents also rather strongly agreed that faculty should occasionally use the ASUC Primer questionnaire in their large or required courses, so that students will have access to evaluations of faculty teaching.**

OVERALL SATISFACTION

A majority of the respondents gave "overall satisfaction" ratings on the high side of the scale, but the percentage of low satisfaction responses was of consequential proportions (25%).**

STUDENTS' GOALS AND THE PROGRAM'S CONTRIBUTION THERETO

The five goals presented to students on the questionnaire were all of high importance. However, training in critical thinking and analysis* and obtaining a broad, general, humanistic, or person-centered education** were viewed as more important than preparation for a career,** promoting social responsibility or developing skills useful in the community, and preparation for graduate or professional school.

A majority of the respondents saw their program's contribution as high in regard to providing training in critical thinking and analysis,** and a plurality thought so with respect to providing a broad, general, humanistic, or person-centered education** and preparing students for graduate or professional school.* Solid majorities, however, saw their program's contribution to preparation for a career* and toward promoting social responsibility and developing skills useful in the community as low.*

The differences between the average "importance" and "program contribution" ratings were rather large for social responsibility/community skills and for career preparation, moderate with respect to a broadly humanistic education and training in critical thinking, and modest as concerns preparation for graduate or professional school.

RECOMMENDATIONS

I. PROCEDURAL

A. Departments. All departments evaluated in this report (see page 9) should review the text and tables carefully* to ascertain the following:

1. Where their students' ratings indicate that they are relatively less effective than other departments or programs.
2. Where their students rate them relatively well, but where most programs appear to need improvement.
3. Where students' ratings indicate a relatively high performance (in order to help other programs).

B. Campus, Senate and College Authorities. Some of the recommendations following need effective review, support, monitoring, and implementation by such administrative and Senate agencies and individuals as the Council on Educational Development, the Committees on Educational Policy and Budget and Interdepartmental Relations, the Executive Committee of the College of Letters and Science, department chairpersons, deans, provosts, the Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Development, and The Vice Chancellor.

II. TOPICAL

A. Curricular Structure and Content. Several of the selection of humanities majors whose students were surveyed appear to need some curricular reinvigoration, the better to attract, hold, and satisfy (facilitate the education of) their undergraduate students. In several cases, new curricular options in which to pursue the major should be designed (or at least thoroughly considered, as a joint faculty-student undertaking). Ways should be found to offer advanced courses in areas where they are not currently available but are desired by a sufficient number of students. Opportunities for academic or academic-experiential application of subject matter, particularly those relating to careers or development of skills useful in the community, should be sought out and developed for use in/as coursework and for referral as extracurriculum. In addition, humanities subject matter is at times inappropriately regarded as having no relationship to human values and current/perennial social issues, no critical methodology, and no historical or sociocultural context (or no use in social- and self- analysis). While faculty initiative will be required, greater faculty receptivity to student input on class structure and content might help to deepen the meaning of coursework in some of the ways indicated above.

*Please remember that ratings, whether as proportions of the respondents or as means, are imprecise but also represent a "best estimate."

B. Advising. In assessing and proposing faculty workloads at the departmental level for review by the Budget Committee and the Administration (as recommended by the Academic Assembly*), departments should formally allocate some faculty time to undergraduate advising, expecting other duties instead for those faculty members who do not serve as undergraduate advisors.

A committee of faculty, students, and appropriate program staff should be formed to improve orientation and advising of various types (career, graduate-professional school, course-professor selection), and to prepare and make provision to update informational handouts as needed by/for students. There is little excuse for the absence of adequate information about career possibilities and means of access, or about employment patterns of recent graduates.

In all programs except (perhaps) the most seriously overenrolled/underfacultied, students should be able to choose from or be assigned to (and be free to change) faculty advisors. In seriously overenrolled/underfacultied programs, the Administration should provide at least enough temporary faculty (for course-teaching relief) or staff resources to enable informational advising functions to be maintained at an especially effective level.

C. Course Goals, Workload, and Competition. Even in disciplines where the material taught/learned is highly subjective, faculty should be clear about course goals and the standards of knowledge and understanding for all coursework, and these expectations should be enunciated at the first meeting of classes. The motivational stimulus provided by an invigorated curriculum (see Topical Recommendation A.), together with clear standards based in part on workload (and minimally on comparative student performance), will engender higher levels and quality of work without a loss of the sense of competition for those students who do not rely more exclusively on intrinsic intellectual disposition, and without harm to those that do.

D. Program Faculties. In characterizing expertise and qualities to be required of applicants to the faculty, departments and administrative and Senate authorities should recognize the value of the results of affirmative action to the education of their students, and often to coverage of the subject matter as well, and redouble efforts to obtain more women and ethnic minority faculty members.

Program faculty and campus authorities should pay careful attention to the adequacy of offerings and faculty staffing patterns to provide coverage of: the interpretations of subject matter by adherents of schools of thought which are currently underrepresented in the/a faculty; social issues and responsibilities related to the field; and information or skills useful in subsequent careers or in the community at large. Faculty members who actually appreciate advising, informal contact and communication, or who can otherwise contribute to the humanistic components of undergraduate education, are also needed in greater numbers. More faculty members with the competencies necessary to implement Topical Recommendation A. will also help to strengthen training in critical thinking and analysis.

The faculty qualities identified in the above paragraph can be preserved only if they are effectively rewarded in the promotion process.

E. Student Input/Participation. Program faculty, with the help of staff who can be permanently assigned to the effort, should accept the responsibility to facilitate the organization of undergraduates, and to develop means of obtaining effective undergraduate input to program decision-making. Working with current organizations where they exist, each program should annually call a general meeting of their undergraduates to invite student election of representatives to serve in the decision-making process. The program should also provide space and a reasonable minimum of support costs for an undergraduate organization. Informational handouts about program governance mechanisms and the means for student input, formal and informal, should be developed. A special committee which includes undergraduates may be needed to review the results of this report, make follow-up recommendations, undertake further information gathering, etc.

All faculty should occasionally use the ASUC Primer questionnaire to evaluate their larger courses and those required for a major, so that students will have access to evaluations of faculty teaching. (Primer also provides full evaluation services.)

DESCRIPTION OF SAMPLES

A Note on the Samples

The particular humanities programs in which we chose to survey students, subsequently termed a "Selected Humanities" sample, were chosen because comparative information greatly enhances the value and meaning of the survey results obtained. The programs were selected around two "core" departments — Spanish and History of Art (hence the inclusion of History) — where more extensive ARU reviews were undertaken. Nevertheless, the methodology and comparative information add considerably to the value of the survey results for all the department samples and all are, of course, very important to the University. Since separate reports are available about Spanish and Art History, each of the programs covered in this report comprise approximately one-eighth of the focus.

Representativeness of the Sample(s)

There are a number of characteristics of the full sample, and of the total number of students in the programs sampled, which can be used to shed light on the question of whether the respondents are generally representative of the majors as a whole, and in each of the programs surveyed.

The Sample As Drawn. Samples were drawn from a list of upper division major students provided by the Office of Admissions and Records (with information effective as of late November 1976). The OAR list included upper division students who had expressed an intended major but had not yet formally declared their major. Students whose names were listed but who did not or had not yet provided addresses to the OAR were omitted from the sample at the outset (except in History of Art and Spanish).* While no close check

*Because of the official status of Academic Review Unit (ARU) work, we requested name lists that included students who did not want their addresses released for unofficial purposes. We were authorized to obtain such lists and informed that the lists we recieved were complete as requested. (The counts on the OAR list tended to be somewhat short of those developed by the Office of Institutional Research.) Nevertheless, we assume that the names without addresses on the OAR lists simply did not have (local?) addresses at the time of study list filing in the Fall and did not subsequently update OAR records. (OIR records are developed from OAR records.)

With the help of the departments, the list of undergraduate majors' names and addresses in Art History and Spanish were rounded out completely. In Spanish, 11 additional majors were identified. In Art History, ARU Research Assistant Hanami identified 30 additional majors (in Winter Quarter) above and beyond the 78 on the OAR list. Of these additional majors, 21 ultimately responded to the ARU questionnaires. We compared the responses of these students across the entire questionnaire with those of the 43 respondents of the 78 on the OAR list. Of 74 Chi-square tests for differences between the two groups, only one had a probability of difference that was at or below the .05 level (.0293), and three were near .06. Because we conducted so many tests, the likelihood is high that a number of probabilities of this (low) magnitude would occur by chance. Hence we conclude that there are few real differences between Art History students who were and were not included on the OAR lists, and we can have some real hope that the same is true for other majors.

was made, the proportion of missing addresses seemed to vary somewhat from program to program, from zero to perhaps ten percent in a few instances.

With two types of exceptions, samples of up to size 60 were drawn from the quasi-alphabetical list of majors provided by the OAR. Samples were constituted by selecting every nth name, beginning with a randomly-chosen name in the first nth, the exact size of the "nth" being determined by the number of majors in the program. (When the initial draw exceeded 60, individuals were deleted using much the same procedure.) In cases where there were fewer than 60 majors total, all students were included. For the miscellaneous aggregations of majors in the Humanities, Social Sciences, and Physical Sciences, a sample of size 75, proportional to the number of students enrolled in all the majors selected for inclusion, was drawn.* Because of the more in-depth reviews in Art History and Spanish, all of their majors were included in the sample.

Response Rate. Of 1472 Undergraduate Major Program Evaluation Questionnaires mailed out, 798 were returned — a gross response rate of 54.2%. While this rate is adequate to good for large scale questionnaire research, it is not necessarily outstanding. However, since ARU questionnaires were sent by nonforwardable bulk rate mail, the net response rate (i.e., of those students who actually received a questionnaire) is higher than 54%. Across the total sample, we have calculated that the move rate of students was above 10%, and that the net response rate — a measure certainly of students' interest level in academic program review — is therefore upwards of 60%.**

Concomitantly, however, the sample is biased against students who (have) move(d). We have no information about whether such students have significantly different perceptions of their academic program, but based on previous research the odds are that they are slightly more critical of their program.

Demographic Measures. We were also to some extent able to compare the sexual distribution of students enrolled in the programs with those majors who responded to the ARU surveys. These comparisons are shown in the accompanying table (on the next page). Some of the other demographic measures, which are discussed in the text following below, are also relevant to the representativeness of the sample.

---

*See footnote "b" of the table on the following page.

**In order to estimate the "move rate," we randomly labelled 150 out-going envelopes with "return address correction requested." Post Office personnel are supposed to return all undeliverable letters thus marked to the sender, with the new address or notice of its unavailability. Eleven percent (11%) of these address corrections were returned to us. In addition, some proportion of these marked envelopes were undoubtedly lost in the shuffle — i.e., delivered to a mailbox but not returned to the P.O. despite the absence of the addressee. (Financial considerations precluded use of this means of correcting addresses for the entire sample.)

Other indicators provided similar estimates of the move rate (e.g., Spanish Department records in early Winter Quarter). In addition, a number of other students may have graduated, or dropped or stopped out. Others may not have responded because they were new to their major.

SELECTED HUMANITIES SAMPLE: RESPONSE RATES AND PERCENTAGE OF WOMEN

Major Program	Number of Usable Responses[a]	Percent of Major Sample Who Responded[b]	Percent of Humanities (Sub)Total[c]	Representativeness of Sample: Percentage of Women		
				Fall 1976 OIR data[d]	In Sample As Drawn[e]	Among Respondents
Music	38	63	13.4	44	45	50
Art	26	43	9.2	68	60	60
History of Art	64	56	22.5[c]	84	83	88
History	35	58	12.3	38	37	40
Misc. Humanities[b]	34	45	12.0	54	60	70
French	26	43	9.2	77	80	92
German	13	43	4.6	69	70	85
Spanish	48	63	16.9[c]	68	70	75
HUMANITIES TOTAL[a]	284	53[c]	100.1	64.3[c]	64.6[c]	70[c]
Social Sciences[b]	41	55		40[d]	48[d]	51[d]
Life-Related Sciences[b]	438	53		—[f]	44[d]	44[d]
TOTALS	763[a]	53		—[f]	52	54

[a]Totals exclude 6 respondents from Italian, 4 from Health Arts and Sciences, and 7 from Public Health (who were eliminated because of the small sample size). In addition, 4 late and 14 other unusable major-change responses were received. Students who changed majors within the Miscellaneous Humanities subsample were retained in that group. Seventeen (17) major-changers within the Life-Related Sciences sample were also retained (as a separate subsample not treated in this report).

[b]The actual number of respondents (i.e., not the original sampling) in the various majors pooled to form the "Miscellaneous Humanities" subsample include: Comparative Literature 3; Dramatic Art, excluding Dance 1; English 20; Humanities Field Major 2; Philosophy 3; Rhetoric 4; and Religious Studies 1.

The Social Sciences respondents consist of majors in: Anthropology 3; Economics 10; Geography 2; Political Science 16; Social Science Field Major 4; and Sociology 6.

The Life-Related Sciences respondents consist of majors in: Bacteriology 32; Biochemistry 30; Biology—Plan A 32; Biology—Plans B,C,D 31; Biology of Natural Resources 26; Biophysics/Medical Physics 25; Botany 26; Chemistry, in College of 28; L & S Chemistry 10; Food, Nutrition and Dietetics 28; L & S Genetics 27; Physiology 30; Psychology 24; Zoology 32; major-changers within life-related sciences 17 (see footnote "a"); Miscellaneous Physical Sciences 40. See the companion report on the life-related sciences for more information about these programs.

The miscellaneous samples in the humanities, physical sciences, and social sciences were derived by taking every nth name across a pre-determined list of programs (in order to obtain a relatively representative sample of 75 students).

[c]Throughout this report, totals are calculated by summing individual responses (rather than by weighting departments equally or by their proportional size). Our "Selected Humanities" sample thus overweights Art History and Spanish, and underweights majors such as English and nonEuropean languages. Separate Academic Review Unit reports are available concerning Spanish and Art History, the latter including information about graduate student perspectives as well. In Art History and Spanish, all of the majors were included in the sample, and addresses (and names) were updated with the help of the Department.

[d]Office of Institutional Research (OIR) figures are based on Office of Admissions and Records (OAR) figures as of the end of the third week of classes in the Fall Quarter. These figures include students who have formally declared a major as well as intended majors indicated by upper division students in L & S. Our list of names from OAR was drawn a few weeks later (effective in late November). OIR accounting of "headcount" majors also uses a ".50 headcount" to represent students enrolled for fewer than 12 units, whereas our counts are purely headcount. In the Miscellaneous Physical Sciences and Social Sciences, students in the general field majors have not been included in the OIR-derived percentages, but are included in columns 5 and 6 of the table. In deriving the OIR percentage of women for the Miscellaneous Humanities, the Humanities Field Major was duly included and adjustments were made for the omission of Dance.

[e]Data in this column were compiled by tabulating the apparent sexual status of names in the OAR list (and by checking against respondents' indications where available), and are subject to minor error.

[f]This figure was not calculated because the reporting in OIR's Campus Statistics is undifferentiated with respect to sexual status in a number of programs (Physical Science Field Major, both College of Natural Resources majors, L & S Genetics, L & S Chemistry).

Demographic Characteristics of Humanities Respondents

Departmental Affiliations. The respondents' majors, and the response rate for each of the programs sampled, as well as overall, are shown in the table on the preceding page.

Sex and Ethnicity. Across the entire sample of 284 students in the humanities programs, [illegible]% of the respondents are women. This corresponds fairly well with, but is a little above the percentage of women in the sample as drawn (65%) [illegible]e particular programs chosen for sampling and the choice of sample s[illegible]as biased the ARU sample somewhat toward the feminine in constitution. [illegible]e Fall 1976 percentage of women in all humanities majors, including t[illegible]the Division of Special Programs, is calculated from OIR figures to be [illegible]%.

In French, German and the Miscellaneous Humanities subsamples, women are perhaps overrepresented among the respondents. However, across the ARU sample of life-related science programs, sexual status of respondent had almost no significant relationships with the evaluative items in the Undergraduate Major Program Evaluation Questionnaire. But no study was made of the effects of sex on student perceptions in the humanities sample or between the sexes within any one program in either sample.

Ethnically, 81.7% of the sample identified themselves as White/Caucasian, and 6.3% declined to state. Chinese-Japanese respondents in the humanities sample constituted 5.3%, and all others 6.7%. Because of the small number of nonwhites, no close comparative analysis of the ethnicity of the sample versus the population was undertaken. As a rough approximation, however, the Fall 1976 OIR percentages of the same groups in all the humanities programs except the Division of Special Programs are: 80.6% White/Caucasian; 3.7% decline to state; 4.9% Chinese/Chinese-American plus Japanese/Japanese-American; 10.7% all others.

Familiarity with Major Program. 1. Source Institution. Only about a third (32.7%) of the humanities respondents came to Berkeley directly from high school. A nearly equal percentage (31.3%) had last attended a two-year college. Almost a quarter (23.2%) came from other colleges or universities, and almost all the rest came most recently from other U.C. campuses (11.3%). ("Other" sources best characterized 1.4%.) Differences between programs were not significant as regards the source institutions of their students (Chi-square probability = .1716). For example, the largest difference from the sample average was found in Art, where 54% of the students came to UCB directly from high school.

2. Courses Completed in Major and Quarters at Berkeley. At the time they answered the survey (principally during Winter Quarter 1977), 39.5% of the humanities respondents had completed 9 or more upper division courses in their major program, and another 25.0% had finished 6-8. Only about one-seventh (14.4%) had completed 0-2 courses.* Most of the respondents were no

*Students with fewer completed upper division courses were more likely to have marked "No Information or Not Applicable" as a response to more of the evaluative questions. About four percent (3.6%) of the respondents had completed no upper division courses by the time they returned the questionnaire, and another 3.6% had completed only one. (The reader may note that only rarely do 100% of the respondents answer any given evaluative item.)

doubt also currently taking courses in their major. There were no differences of consequence between the humanities programs as to the number of courses that their responding students had completed.*

About one-sixth (16.2%) of the respondents had been at UCB for three or fewer quarters and twice that many (32.4%) had been here for 4-6 quarters. Longer-term denizens included 23.9% at 7-9 quarters and 27.5% at 10 or more quarters. There were also no differences of consequence between the programs as to students' number of quarters at Berkeley.**

Due to the low number of majors in the OAR name list (30) and the moderate response rate therefrom (43%), the sample in the German Department is considerably less adequate than the others. (Although the respondents in German were also enrolled at Berkeley for slightly fewer quarters than average, all 13 had completed 2 or more upper division courses in German at UCB.) Despite these limitations of the data and the considerable caution necessary when ascribing meaning to the returns from German majors, these students were retained in the sample to provide at least a rough approximation of student views in that major, and in a third language generally.

Employment and Finances. There were no significant differences between the respondents in the various majors as regards the proportion of the total cost of college that their parents were willing or able to provide (F-probability = .261). Overall, 33.2% of the respondents' parents were willing or able to provide 81-100% of the costs, and 34.4% were willing or able to provide none of it. There were also no significant differences by program in the respondents' hourly employment patterns (F-probability = .278). Overall, 40.9% of the humanities students were not employed at all in Fall 1976, compared to 51.1% who were working more than 10 hours a week. (In the life-related or pre-health science sample, 51.9% of the students were unemployed.)

Academic Workload. The average number of units taken in Fall 1976 was fairly similar from program to program (F-probability = .105), but Music students seemed to take fewer units than did French students (54% versus 19% at 13 or fewer units respectively). The average number of hours of study outside of class per week seemed even more nearly the same from program to program (F-probability = .331). (See also page 17.)

*Statement based on an F-probability of .776 (with code 9 = 9 or more courses) and Chi-square probability of .3133 (with too many cells and including Italian at N = 6), and "eyeballing the data."

**Statement based on an F-probability of .150 (with code 4 = 10 or more quarters), a Chi-square probability of .1887 (including Italian at N = 6), and eyeballing the data. Differences, insofar as they have any reality to them, include: Art had no respondents with three or fewer quarters of attendance (but had 38% at 4-6 quarters); Music students were perhaps a little more experienced at Berkeley (68% at 7 or more quarters) than were students in German (38% at 7 or more quarters) or Art History (42% at 7 or more quarters).

THE INTERPRETATION OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE DATA

Questionnaire Development

Development of the general Undergraduate Major Program Evaluation Questionnaire began in late 1975, as a joint Academic Affairs Office/Jeff Koon project. Last year's draft version was used as a guide in questionnaire development by some ARU staff as well as by some ASUC Mini-Grant recipients. This year, the item content of last year's draft was reviewed systematically, with reference to various sets of program review criteria, in order to enable inquiry into the most fundamental concerns in program review about which undergraduates might reasonably be expected to have knowledge or views. Three student review committees (pre-health sciences, History of Art, Spanish) as well as ARU staff, some Academic Affairs Office staff and an ASUC Senator or two helped in the extensive refinement of the items during the Fall of 1976.

Absolute and Relative Perspectives on the Data

In the interpretation of the questionnaire data contained in this text, there are two principal kinds of analytic perspectives employed. The first, or "absolute" perspective, focuses on the percentage of students who chose one (or more) response categories as contrasted with the percentage who chose other response categories. (See below for response categories.) The second, or "relative" perspective, is one that compares the evaluations by students of their respective programs.

The relative perspective can be particularly important in identifying the comparative strengths and weaknesses of the various programs evaluated. In areas where a department is relatively strong, it may serve as a possible model for other academic units or programs. Similarly, in areas where at least some other programs are relatively stronger, there is a good likelihood that improvement in weaker programs is fairly readily possible. In areas where all programs are rated as having about the same degree of weakness, change may be needed across the board, but may be more difficult or require new methods. In addition, without the relative perspective, we cannot gain nearly as good an idea of whether a moderate level of agreement or disagreement (e.g., 40%) by students to a particular questionnaire item is suggestive of an effective or ineffective performance by their program.

Reporting the Data

In reporting percentages in the text and the tables, the response categories of "Strongly Agree" and "Agree" are combined (to "agree"), as are "Strongly Disagree" and "Disagree" (to "disagree"). The response category "In Between" has been retained as a separate (third) entity and may be calculated from the other two values given in the text or by reference to the tables. For the beleaguered nonstatistician, data are always reported in percentages (with one exception). Where significant differences between programs are present, data are also reported as means, such that the reader may refer to either.

Analysis of Means

In making comparisons or relative judgments between students' ratings of various academic programs, we have in most cases relied upon the F-test to ascertain whether there are "significant" differences in the average (mean) ratings by their students. For purposes of calculating the mean ratings,

1 = Strongly Disagree
2 = Disagree
3 = In Between
4 = Agree
5 = Strongly Agree.

Data from students who used the response category "No Information or Not Applicable" (or who left the question blank) were omitted from all reported percentages and F-tests, but the reader may calculate the overall percentage of such "nonapplicable" responses, whether for the entire sample or for a particular program, by comparing the total number of applicable responses presented in the tables with the sample sizes given in the table on page 9.

The "F-probability" figures in the tables represent the probability that there are significant differences between the mean ratings of the various programs. (Lower numerical values indicate that there is a greater likelihood that the differences in program ratings are meaningful.) In addition, the confidence intervals associated with each mean (e.g., "± .47") indicate that there is a 95% chance that the "true" mean for a particular program falls within the range indicated (e.g., plus or minus 0.47 from the reported mean). Where the probability is low that the observed differences are meaningful ones, we have typically presented a table in which the mean rating is not reported.

Analytic License

If the confidence intervals (95% probability range) for any two program means do not overlap, the programs may be said to have significantly different ratings. While generally following this guideline, the discussions in the text have taken some analytic or poetic license in interpretation, partly because the obtained means are the best estimate we have of a program's standing, but also because of the awkwardness of omitting programs with equivalent means but wider confidence intervals from the listing of high- or low-rated programs. Nevertheless, we have tried to choose wordings for the text with a considerable sense of responsibility and caution. The reader may, of course, make his or her own interpretations by reference to the tables.

For the typical item on which differences between programs are reported in the text, the reader should also be aware that the low-rated programs are generally different from the high-rated programs mentioned, but that neither is significantly different from the large array of programs with means in the middle ranks. Some of the high- and low-rated programs, however, may well be significantly different from the overall sample mean, which has a small confidence interval because of the large number of respondents.

Findings

CURRICULUM

Structure of the Major

Although some students expressed reservations, ratings of the humanities programs rather clearly indicated that there were few "artificial prerequisites" to the majors. On the whole, only 14% of the students responding agreed that some of the lower division prerequisites were not really necessary for the major and 76% disagreed.* (There seemed to be even less doubt about the necessity of prerequisites in the humanities than in the social or life-related sciences.**)

In several programs, as well as overall, more students disagreed than agreed that there were enough course plan options to choose from within their major. Overall, 49% disagreed and 36% agreed. Students in Spanish were very clearly dissatisfied in this regard (78% disagreed), and a majority also disagreed in Art (60%), Music (54%) and Art History (51%). Students in History seemed least dissatisfied (70% agreed). Students in the life-related and social sciences were generally much more satisfied with the number of course plan options within those majors.

Overall in the humanities sample, 69% of the students disagreed that there were too many required courses in their major, and 14% agreed. Majors in Spanish, however, who were split nearly evenly between disagreement, agreement, and the "in between" response, raised more questions about the number of required courses than did several other programs' students.

Coverage of Content in the Major

The availability of advanced courses in all areas of student interest in their major was much more problematic in the humanities than in the life-related or social sciences (where solid majorities felt advanced courses in all their areas of interest were available). In the humanities, 46% disagreed and 36% agreed. The problem seemed greatest in Art (67% disagree) and Spanish (63% disagree), and only somewhat better in Music (60% disagree) and Art History (48% disagree).*** History (22% disagree) and

*In the text, the percentage agreeing ("Strongly Agree" plus "Agree" and percentage disagreeing ("Strongly Disagree" plus "Disagree") are typically reported for the humanities sample as a whole. The percentage of "In Between" responses are seldom reported, but they may be readily calculated.

**The life-related sciences are labelled "PreHlt" in the tables, representing "Pre-health." The programs included (see "Description of Samples") are those which could provide a background for health science-related careers, even though many of the majors are not intending to go into such careers.

***Please note that Music and Art History have the same mean rating (see table), indicating that although the percentage of disagreement was lower in the latter, the strength of disagreement (and/or weakness of agreement) was higher.

CURRICULUM

Structure of the Major

Some of the lower division prerequisites are not really necessary for the major. [col. 40] [F-prob. = .096]

	MUSIC	ART	*ARTHIS	HIST	MISC* HUMANS	FRENCH	GERMAN	SPAN*	TOTAL* HUMANS	Misc* SocSci	* PreHlt
S/Disagree	78%	69%	75%	72%	67%	100%	90%	69%	76%	57%	59%
In Between	3	23	9	17	4	0	10	17	10	26	12
S/Agree	19	8	16	10	30	0	0	14	14	17	29
N	32	26	56	29	27	25	10	36**	241	35	421

There are enough course plan options to meet my specialized interests in the major. [col. 34] [F-prob. = .000]

	MUSIC	ART	*ARTHIS	HIST	MISC* HUMANS	FRENCH	GERMAN	SPAN*	TOTAL* HUMANS	Misc* SocSci	* PreHlt
S/Disagree	54%	60%	51%	18%	42%	27%	33%	78%	49%	18%	20%
In Between	17	12	21	12	12	15	17	11	15	8	17
S/Agree	29	28	29	70	45	58	50	11	36	74	62
N	35	25	63	33	33	26	12	45	272	39	419
*Mean	2.57	2.56	2.70	3.79	3.15	3.27	3.17	1.98	2.81	3.85	3.54
95% ±	.47	.56	.32	.43	.48	.44	.76	.31	.16	.38	.11

There are too many required courses for the major. [col. 35] [F-prob. = .000]

	MUSIC	ART	*ARTHIS	HIST	MISC* HUMANS	FRENCH	GERMAN	SPAN*	TOTAL* HUMANS	Misc* SocSci	* PreHlt
S/Disagree	68%	69%	78%	85%	82%	81%	58%	35%	69%	80%	61%
In Between	14	15	14	9	9	15	17	33	16	12	23
S/Agree	19	15	8	6	9	4	25	33	14	7	16
N	37	26	64	34	33	26	12	46	278	41	430
*Mean	2.49	2.31	2.14	1.97	2.24	2.15	2.67	3.07	2.37	2.15	2.50
95% ±	.39	.47	.23	.26	.32	.25	.73	.33	.12	.29	.09

Coverage of Content in the Major

Advanced courses are of offered in the major (or are otherwise available) in all of my areas of interest. [col. 42] [F-prob. = .000]

	MUSIC	ART	*ARTHIS	HIST	MISC* HUMANS	FRENCH	GERMAN	SPAN*	TOTAL* HUMANS	Misc* SocSci	* PreHlt
S/Disagree	60%	67%	48%	22%	34%	30%	11%	63%	46%	17%	18%
In Between	3	13	21	25	16	17	22	22	18	26	19
S/Agree	37	21	30	53	50	52	67	15	36	57	63
N	30	24	56	32	32	23	9**	41	247	35	389
*Mean	2.70	2.29	2.70	3.38	3.19	3.13	3.56	2.27	2.81	3.54	3.55
95% ±	.46	.46	.31	.43	.41	.51	.56	.36	.15	.33	.10

The courses in this program do not relate well to each other; it is hard to get a good perspective on the field. [col. 37] [F-prob. = .018]

	MUSIC	ART	*ARTHIS	HIST	MISC* HUMANS	FRENCH	GERMAN	SPAN*	TOTAL* HUMANS	Misc* SocSci	* PreHlt
S/Disagree	73%	52%	55%	77%	74%	85%	80%	63%	67%	74%	73%
In Between	18	32	22	13	12	12	20	22	19	13	16
S/Agree	9	16	23	10	15	4	0	15	14	13	11
N	33	25	60	31	34	26	10	46	265	38	422
*Mean	2.15	2.52	2.63	2.00	2.26	2.08	1.90	2.48	2.33	2.34	2.23
95% ±	.31	.43	.27	.38	.35	.25	.53	.26	.12	.34	.09

*Please see "Description of Samples," especially regarding ARTHIS, MISC HUMANS, SPAN, TOTAL HUMANS, Misc SocSci, and PreHlt. F-tests exclude Misc SocSci and PreHlt, and are based on the original metric, as are means, i.e., 1= Strongly Disagree, 2 = Disagree, . . . 5 = Strongly Agree.

**Percentage of "No Information or Not Applicable" and blank responses is 25% or more.

possibly German students (11% disagree) were more satisfied with the coverage of advanced topics.

Fragmentation of the curriculum within the major was not a particularly important problem in any of the programs surveyed. Students in Art History, Art, and Spanish perhaps raised a few more questions than other humanities majors, but a majority of students in every program disagreed that it was hard to get a good perspective on their field because the courses did not relate well to each other. Overall, 67% of the humanities students disagreed, and 14% agreed.

In most upper division courses in their major, there was also little or no waste of classtime to help students whose background in the subject was weak. Only 10% of the humanities students saw this as a problem, whereas 77% didn't.

In only one department did our question about the availability of enough fieldwork-related courses (and credit for appropriate volunteer work) receive applicable responses by more than three-quarters of the respondents. But in that department (Art History) as well as in the others, students who gave applicable responses usually disagreed. Overall, 57% gave applicable responses, and of these, 71% disagreed and 16% agreed. While the interest in fieldwork may be lower in the humanities than in the life-related and social sciences, there appeared to be some real unmet need in several programs.

The three questions about methodology or technical courses were regarded as not applicable (or not yet answerable) by 42-47% of the humanities respondents. Considering only the applicable responses, students did not usually want more emphasis on theory as contrasted with application in their methodology courses. In fact, experience in real problem-solving and analysis was seen as insufficient by as many students (41%) as not (43%). Respondents were also split about whether their methodology courses overemphasized traditional methods or were not up-to-date: 38% agreed and 42% disagreed. While differences between program ratings were large, it is difficult to know how much credibility to give to them.* For some of these programs, however, one might hazard the guess that a course in critical methodology would strengthen the curriculum.

Interpretation of Content

For the humanities sample as a whole, 26% of the majors did not see the applicability or had too little information to answer a question about their program's coverage of the contributions of the nondominant "schools of thought." Of the 74% who answered, more disagreed (52%) than agreed (28%) that such coverage was sufficient. Students in Spanish (86%) and Art (67%), and possibly in Art History (56%) and Music (54%) were less likely to agree that there was enough course coverage of the different scholarly interpretations (or equivalent) within their field. In the case of Spanish, and very

*For example, there was high proportional agreement in Spanish (79%) and Music (54%) and an even split in Art History (where applicable responses constituted 50%, 68%, and 63% respectively).

Most of the upper division courses in the program waste a lot of class time helping the students with no background in the subject. [col. 49] [F-prob. = .392]

	MUSIC	ART	*ARTHIS	HIST	MISC* HUMANS	FRENCH	GERMAN	SPAN*	TOTAL* HUMANS	Misc* SocSci	*PreHlt
S/Disagree	86%	71%	78%	79%	81%	83%	90%	61%	77%	70%	84%
In Between	10	8	10	18	10	13	10	22	13	16	10
S/Agree	3	21	12	3	10	4	0	17	10	11	6
N	29	24	59	33	31	23	10	41	250	37	395

There are enough field-work, internship, lab, or other academic-experiential course offerings in this program, and/or credit is readily available for appropriate types of volunteer experience. [col. 39] [F-prob. = .113]

	MUSIC	ART	*ARTHIS	HIST	MISC* HUMANS	FRENCH	GERMAN	SPAN*	TOTAL* HUMANS	Misc* SocSci	*PreHlt
S/Disagree	71%	56%	75%	59%	65%	63%	100%	81%	71%	43%	28%
In Between	19	13	13	12	6	25	0	11	13	25	21
S/Agree	10	31	12	29	29	13	0	7	16	32	51
N	21**	16**	52	17**	17**	8**	3**	27**	161**	28**	366

The program's methodology or technical courses: Should put more emphasis on general theoretical understanding rather than application. [col. 44] [F-prob. = .060]

	MUSIC	ART	*ARTHIS	HIST	MISC* HUMANS	FRENCH	GERMAN	SPAN*	TOTAL* HUMANS	Misc* SocSci	*PreHlt
S/Disagree	77%	61%	55%	63%	56%	67%	100%	44%	61%	57%	68%
In Between	12	22	30	33	28	17	0	17	24	26	26
S/Agree	12	17	15	4	17	17	0	39	16	17	6
N	26**	18**	40**	24**	18**	6**	2**	18**	152**	35	392

The program's methodology or technical courses: Do not provide the student with enough experience in real problem-solving and analysis. [col. 43] [F-prob. = .011]

	MUSIC	ART	*ARTHIS	HIST	MISC* HUMANS	FRENCH	GERMAN	SPAN*	TOTAL* HUMANS	Misc* SocSci	*PreHlt
S/Disagree	65%	35%	33%	58%	56%	40%	50%	7%	43%	27%	51%
In Between	9	35	22	8	13	20	0	13	17	41	25
S/Agree	26	29	46	33	31	40	50	80	41	32	24
N	23**	17**	46**	24**	16**	5**	4**	15**	150**	37	389

The program's methodology or technical courses: Overemphasize traditional methodology or are not up-to-date. [col. 45] [F-prob. = .000]

	MUSIC	ART	*ARTHIS	HIST	MISC* HUMANS	FRENCH	GERMAN	SPAN*	TOTAL* HUMANS	Misc* SocSci	*PreHlt
S/Disagree	27%	67%	38%	58%	71%	17%	100%	4%	42%	53%	74%
In Between	19	28	23	23	5	33	0	17	20	31	18
S/Agree	54	6	40	19	24	50	0	79	38	17	8
N	26**	18**	40**	26**	21**	6**	3**	24**	164**	36	381

Interpretation of Content

There are enough courses available in this program which explore the contributions of the nondominant "schools of thought" (e.g., radicals, conservatives, traditionalists, futurists, women, minorities, etc.). [col. 48] [F-prob. = .000]

	MUSIC	ART	*ARTHIS	HIST	MISC* HUMANS	FRENCH	GERMAN	SPAN*	TOTAL* HUMANS	Misc* SocSci	*PreHlt
S/Disagree	54%	67%	56%	42%	33%	22%	38%	86%	52%	40%	52%
In Between	29	11	22	16	18	43	13	8	20	11	22
S/Agree	17	22	22	42	48	35	50	5	28	49	27
N	24**	18**	36**	31	33	23	8**	37	210**	35	172**
*Mean	2.42	2.50	2.44	3.00	3.21	3.35	3.13	1.81	2.66	3.06	2.64
95% ±	.53	.55	.37	.47	.49	.46	.83	.27	.17	.47	.17

*Please see "Description of Samples," especially regarding ARTHIS, MISC HUMANS, SPAN, TOTAL HUMANS, Misc SocSci, and PreHlt. F-tests exclude Misc SocSci and PreHlt, and are based on the original metric, as are means, i.e., 1 = Strongly Disagree, 2 = Disagree . . . 5 = Strongly Agree.

**Percentage of "No Information or Not Applicable" and blank responses is 25% or more.

nearly so in Art, a majority of all the respondents (i.e., including applicable and nonapplicable responses) agreed that coverage was insufficient of the nondominant schools of thought.

Of the applicable responses (70%), humanities students more agreed (42%) than disagreed (34%) that their program's faculty show enough concern about social issues in teaching their classes. But in Spanish, a majority of students disagreed (56%). Students in German (80%), French (70%) and History (64%) were more likely to agree that their faculty show enough concern about social issues when teaching classes.

Class Size

The humanities students did not generally feel that large lecture classes can provide adequate learning opportunities in their field, and in some programs, the questionnaire item was not recognized as applicable by many students. In Art History and to a lesser extent in History, however, large class sizes were recognized as providing adequate or mostly adequate learning opportunities by about 70% of the students (if one adds the "agree" and "in between" responses). In Art History, unlike History, however, students did not usually feel that the curriculum was structured so that students will have enough small seminars (Art History—50% disagree; History—13% disagree).

Scheduling

Scheduling of courses (time, quarter), or their actual availability (as contrasted with their existence in the catalog), was often seen as a problem in the humanities programs surveyed. Overall, 49% agreed that scheduling was poor and 32% disagreed. Scheduling seemed worst in German (73% agree) and Spanish (63% agree) and best in History (28% agree).

Equipment

Our question about whether there was a shortage of equipment, supplies, or media materials received high nonapplicable response rates except in Art, Art History, and Music. Seventy-four percent (74%) of the Art students agreed there is a shortage of equipment, supplies, or media materials, and the same answer tended to emerge in Art History (49% agree). Reaction in Music was bimodal (41% agree, 48% disagree). The extent of agreement in Art was greater than in any science program surveyed, where the highest level of agreement was 38%.

Competition, Grading, Workload, Testing

Student reaction in the humanities was evenly split concerning whether they learn best in an environment with competition at a level such as we have at Berkeley. Overall, 40% disagreed and 39% agreed. (22% marked "Strongly Disagree" and 14% marked "Strongly Agree.") While the responses in the various majors were largely similar, perhaps a slightly higher percentage of students in Art History disagree (56%) that they study and learn best in an environment as competitive as Berkeley's, and students in German may have had the least problem (10% disagreed).

Faculty in this program show enough concern about social issues in teaching their subjects. [col. 30] [F-prob. = .000]

	MUSIC	ART	*ARTHIS	HIST	*MISC HUMANS	FRENCH	GERMAN	SPAN*	*TOTAL HUMANS	Misc* SocSci	*PreHlt
S/Disagree	60%	39%	31%	21%	31%	10%	0%	56%	34%	15%	22%
In Between	33	33	33	14	19	20	20	18	24	20	32
S/Agree	7	28	36	64	50	70	80	26	42	65	46
N	15**	18**	42**	28	26	20	10	39	198**	40	320**
*Mean	2.13	2.83	2.90	3.50	3.35	3.70	3.90	2.49	3.03	3.65	3.30
95% ±	.55	.55	.39	.51	.56	.46	.41	.36	.18	.37	.12

Class Sizes

Large lecture classes can generally provide adequate learning opportunities in this field. [col. 38] [F-prob. = .000]

	MUSIC	ART	*ARTHIS	HIST	*MISC HUMANS	FRENCH	GERMAN	SPAN*	*TOTAL HUMANS	Misc* SocSci	*PreHlt
S/Disagree	62%	67%	31%	28%	53%	74%	100%	69%	50%	46%	46%
In Between	19	22	18	44	22	11	0	17	21	35	27
S/Agree	19	11	51	28	25	16	0	14	29	19	28
N	21**	9**	61	32	32	19**	7**	29**	210**	37	400
*Mean	2.10	1.78	3.16	2.84	2.50	2.00	1.43	2.10	2.54	2.57	2.73
95% ±	.56	.92	.27	.40	.43	.60	.49	.40	.16	.33	.10

The curriculum is structured so that all majors will have a sufficient number of small seminars. [col. 40] [F-prob. = .004]

	MUSIC	ART	*ARTHIS	HIST	*MISC HUMANS	FRENCH	GERMAN	SPAN*	*TOTAL HUMANS	Misc* SocSci	*PreHlt
S/Disagree	31%	60%	50%	13%	33%	24%	13%	50%	37%	54%	58%
In Between	6	13	17	23	20	18	25	13	16	20	20
S/Agree	63	27	33	63	47	59	63	37	46	26	21
N	32	15**	58	30	30	17**	8**	30**	220	35	298**
*Mean	3.34	2.47	2.76	3.63	3.13	3.35	3.63	2.73	3.07	2.40	2.51
95% ±	.47	.72	.30	.41	.43	.54	.77	.48	.16	.43	.12

Scheduling of Courses

Scheduling of courses is poor in this program: Required courses or subjects of interest to me are offered at the same time, in the same quarter, or are not being offered this year. [col. 36] [F-prob. = .032]

	MUSIC	ART	*ARTHIS	HIST	*MISC HUMANS	FRENCH	GERMAN	SPAN*	*TOTAL HUMANS	Misc* SocSci	*PreHlt
S/Disagree	33%	42%	32%	47%	38%	21%	18%	22%	32%	38%	41%
In Between	11	17	19	25	21	33	9	15	19%	23	23
S/Agree	56	42	49	28	41	46	73	63	49	38	35
N	36	24	63	32	34	24	11	46	270	39	418
*Mean	3.31	3.08	3.21	2.78	3.21	3.42	4.09	3.61	3.28	3.18	2.97
95% ±	.43	.54	.29	.40	.43	.43	.82	.36	.14	.41	.11

Equipment

There is a shortage of adequate equipment, supplies or media materials for use by students in this program. [col. 41] [F-prob. = .000]

	MUSIC	ART	*ARTHIS	HIST	*MISC HUMANS	FRENCH	GERMAN	SPAN*	*TOTAL HUMANS	Misc* SocSci	*PreHlt
S/Disagree	48%	22%	29%	57%	61%	77%	67%	43%	43%	42%	57%
In Between	10	4	22	26	11	8	0	29	17	37	22
S/Agree	41	74	49	17	28	15	33	29	40	21	22
N	29	23	59	23**	18**	13**	3**	28**	196**	19**	370
*Mean	2.97	3.78	3.32	2.52	2.56	2.15	2.33	2.86	3.00	2.84	2.59
95% ±	.49	.52	.29	.45	.60	.60	3.79	.33	.17	.43	.11

*Please see "Description of Samples," especially regarding ARTHIS, MISC HUMANS, SPAN, TOTAL HUMANS, Misc SocSci, and PreHlt. F-tests exclude Misc SocSci and PreHlt, and are based on the original metric, as are means, i.e., 1 = Strongly Disagree, 2 = Disagree . . . 5 = Strongly Agree.

**Percentage of "No Information or Not Applicable" and blank responses is 25% or more.

Grading was usually seen as more rigorous in the students' own program than in other programs. Overall, 51% thought that getting an "A" grade was harder in their own program than elsewhere, and 17% disagreed. Differences between program ratings were modest (i.e., to the point of questioning their significance statistically). Workload per unit of credit awarded was also seen as heavier in the students' own program — 48% agreed and 25% disagreed. However, differences in program ratings were fairly substantial. Students in Music (88% agree) and German (83% agree) very decisively saw their workload per unit as heavy, while students in French (21% agree) tended to see their workload as average or below.

We also attempted to analyze workload by dividing the average number of units carried by the students into the average number of hours studied outside of class, as reported for Fall Quarter 1976. The results were not subjected to statistical analysis and are highly suggestive rather than fairly precise for several reasons, including: 1) students do not take classes solely in their own major; 2) grades earned may vary from student to student;* 3) the number of class hours (lecture plus section or equivalent) varies to some extent from program to program; 4) it is not entirely clear what constitutes "study" nor what students count as "hours of study," particularly in nonscience departments where serious unassigned reading, informal discussions among students, and perhaps even some writing of papers may not be included in students' reported study time.

In any case, the overall humanities average was 1.38 hours per week of study outside of class. Slightly on the high side of average were the Miscellaneous Humanities grouping (1.56 hours/week), German (1.52), and Music (1.49), and Art was a hair lower than other programs (at 1.25 hours per week). The small range of mean hours per week of study, however, suggests that there may be no real differences between the programs' students. (Workload did seem somewhat lower in the small sample of Miscellaneous Social Sciences, however, at 1.10 hours per week, and somewhat higher, perhaps because it is more precisely definable, in the life-related sciences, where program averages ranged from 1.33 to 1.83.)

There was perhaps a little less faculty clarity concerning goals of course coverage and what students will need to know or do to get an "A" in the humanities than in the social or life-related sciences. Differences between the humanities programs were not particularly meaningful. Overall, 48% of the humanities students disagreed that faculty are clear about course goals and expectations regarding grading, and 27% agreed. Despite this possible problem,** students seemed generally satisfied that tests in their program have measured fairly accurately their knowledge of the material in most of their courses. Overall, 59% agreed and 16% disagreed. However, testing was perhaps less adequate in Spanish (38% agree) than in the Miscellaneous Humanities grouping (73% agree) or Art History (65% agree).

---

*We asked students only for their GPA in upper division courses completed in their major.

**The question probably should have asked if faculty "should" more clearly state what their courses will cover and what students need to know or do to get an "A."

Competition, Workload, Grading, Testing

I study and learn best in an environment with competition at a level such as we have here at Berkeley. [col. 58] [F-prob. = .308]

	MUSIC	ART	*ARTHIS	HIST	MISC* HUMANS	FRENCH	GERMAN	SPAN*	TOTAL* HUMANS	Misc* SocSci	* PreHlt
S/Disagree	33%	33%	56%	39%	35%	38%	18%	36%	40%	41%	47%
In Between	17	29	17	23	19	25	18	25	21	24	26
S/Agree	50	38	27	39	45	38	64	39	39	35	27
N	30	24	59	31	31	24	11	44	254	37	21

Grading in this program is more rigorous than in most—it is very hard to get an "A." [col. 21] [F-prob. = .060]

	MUSIC	ART	*ARTHIS	HIST	MISC* HUMANS	FRENCH	GERMAN	SPAN*	TOTAL* HUMANS	Misc* SocSci	* PreHlt
S/Disagree	8%	13%	15%	6%	27%	31%	25%	16%	17%	18%	10%
In Between	36	33	26	32	30	35	58	32	32	45	28
S/Agree	56	54	58	62	42	35	17	52	51	38	62
N	36	24	62	34	33	26	12	44	271	40	411

Compared to work in other programs, the students in this program must do a lot of work for the number of units (credit) awarded. [col. 47] [F-prob. = .000]

	MUSIC	ART	*ARTHIS	HIST	MISC* HUMANS	FRENCH	GERMAN	SPAN*	TOTAL* HUMANS	Misc* SocSci	* PreHlt
S/Disagree	3%	25%	30%	19%	44%	50%	8%	16%	25%	41%	11%
In Between	9	25	40	26	25	29	8	32	27	53	18
S/Agree	88	50	30	55	31	21	83	52	48	6	71
N	33	24	60	31	32	24	12	44	260	34	417
*Mean	4.58	3.42	3.08	3.55	2.97	2.67	4.33	3.59	3.45	2.62	3.99
95% ±	.28	.50	.25	.41	.46	.43	.63	.33	.14	.23	.10

Faculty in my program clearly state at the outset what the courses will cover and what students need to know or do to get an "A." [col. 23] [F-prob. = .407]

	MUSIC	ART	*ARTHIS	HIST	MISC* HUMANS	FRENCH	GERMAN	SPAN*	TOTAL* HUMANS	Misc* SocSci	* PreHlt
S/Disagree	53%	55%	47%	39%	38%	45%	36%	61%	48%	40%	36%
In Between	26	23	23	30	32	18	18	23	25	28	32
S/Agree	21	23	31	30	29	36	45	16	27	33	32
N	38	22	62	33	34	22	11	44	266	40	421

Tests given by faculty in this program have measured fairly accurately my knowledge of the material in most of my courses. [col. 22] [F-prob. = .019]

	MUSIC	ART	*ARTHIS	HIST	MISC* HUMANS	FRENCH	GERMAN	SPAN*	TOTAL* HUMANS	Misc* SocSci	* PreHlt
S/Disagree	16%	17%	11%	17%	3%	12%	20%	31%	16%	17%	20%
In Between	16	25	24	20	24	40	10	31	25	20	27
S/Agree	68	58	65	63	73	48	70	38	59	63	53
N	37	12**	62	35	33	25	10	45	259	41	419
*Mean	3.59	3.33	3.66	3.49	3.82	3.56	3.50	3.00	3.50	3.56	3.36
95% ±	.32	.78	.24	.38	.24	.45	.61	.33	.12	.31	.10

TEACHING

N.B.: See also "Informal Relations with Students," "Competition, Workload, Grading, Testing," "Interpretation of Content," and "Students' Goals and the Program's Contribution Thereto."

*Please see "Description of Samples," especially regarding ARTHIS, MISC HUMANS, SPAN, TOTAL HUMANS, Misc SocSci, and PreHlt. F-tests exclude Misc SocSci and PreHlt, and are based on the original metric, as are means, i.e., 1 = Strongly Disagree, 2 = Disagree . . . 5 = Strongly Agree.

**Percentage of "No Information or Not Applicable" and blank responses is 25% or more.

TEACHING

See also: "Informal Relations with Students," "Competition, Workload, Grading, Testing," "Interpretation of Content," and "Students' Goals and the Program's Contribution Thereto."

Lectures and coursework within the students' major were regarded as interesting and challenging by a large majority (66%) of the humanities students; only 9% disagreed.* In Spanish, however, which was rated significantly lower than every other program, respondents were split: 31% agreed, 29% disagreed, and 40% chose the middle response.

A fraction over 75% of the students ventured a rating of the T.A.s or readers in their program, and most disagree (63%) that assistants were either poorly chosen or poorly trained and supervised. Nineteen percent (19%), however, agreed with this rather strongly-worded proposition.** Because of the variations in response rates from program to program (probably due to such factors as differing source institutions of respondents and T.A. allocations to departments), the moderate differences between the ratings of the adequacy of T.A.s may not be particularly trustworthy.

Feedback from faculty, T.A.s and readers on midterms, papers, and class performance was regarded as thorough enough by 58% of the respondents, and as insufficient by 20%. There were no differences between the students' ratings of the different programs. Feedback to students in the humanities was rated as better than in the social or life-related sciences, where 33% and 43% agreed, respectively.

According to their majors' ratings, faculty receptivity to student input on class structure and content varied rather widely from program to program. Overall, student views were rather evenly divided — 34% saw faculty as receptive to student input, 38% didn't. Faculty receptivity was rated lowest in Spanish (64% disagree) and Art History (59% disagree), and highest in French (67% agree) and German (67% agree).

Learning

In developing the ARU questionnaire, the item about retention of subject matter learned was regarded as particularly important. By this measure, the students gave fairly high marks to the educational process at Berkeley. In the humanities, 62% agreed that they would remember for a long time to come a lot of what they had learned in their program's courses. Eighteen percent (18%) disagreed. However, the likelihood of retention of subject matter was rated lower in Spanish (33% agree; 38% disagree) than in some other programs.

---

*In order to minimize the overlap with typical teaching evaluation forms, we combined "lectures" and "coursework" into one question — perhaps unwisely since students would be expected to be fairly enthused about the subject matter.

**The question on T.A.s and readers should probably be reformulated, e.g., to ask about the level of meaningful contribution to students' education.

The lectures and coursework in this program are interesting and challenging. [col. 27] [F-prob. = .000]

	MUSIC	ART	*ARTHIS	HIST	MISC* HUMANS	FRENCH	GERMAN	SPAN*	TOTAL* HUMANS	Misc* SocSci	*PreHlt
S/Disagree	0%	9%	10%	6%	3%	4%	0%	29%	9%	10%	5%
In Between	22	27	19	24	18	31	8	40	25	23	20
S/Agree	78	64	71	71	79	65	92	31	66	68	75
N	36	22	63	34	34	26	12	45	272	40	477
*Mean	4.08	3.77	3.92	4.00	4.00	3.77	4.17	2.96	3.79	3.78	3.95
95% ±	.25	.47	.25	.32	.26	.31	.37	.33	.12	.31	.08

Comments or review provided by faculty, T.A.s and readers on my midterms, papers, problem sets, experiments and class performance is usually thorough enough. [col. 20] [F-prob. = .477]

	MUSIC	ART	*ARTHIS	HIST	MISC* HUMANS	FRENCH	GERMAN	SPAN*	TOTAL* HUMANS	Misc* SocSci	*PreHlt
S/Disagree	16%	16%	20%	17%	24%	17%	18%	29%	20%	30%	29%
In Between	14	16	17	34	21	29	18	22	21	38	29
S/Agree	70	68	63	49	56	54	64	49	58	33	43
N	37	19	64	35	34	24	11	45	269	40	390

Most of the faculty in this program are receptive to student input on class structure and content. [col. 24] [F-prob. = .000]

	MUSIC	ART	*ARTHIS	HIST	MISC* HUMANS	FRENCH	GERMAN	SPAN*	TOTAL* HUMANS	Misc* SocSci	*PreHlt
S/Disagree	37%	17%	59%	31%	23%	4%	0%	64%	38%	38%	27%
In Between	20	33	25	28	39	29	33	25	28	31	30
S/Agree	43	50	15	41	39	67	67	11	34	31	43
N	35	24	59	32	31	24	12	44	261	39	390
*Mean	2.94	3.29	2.44	3.09	3.23	3.79	3.75	2.30	2.92	2.87	3.23
95% ±	.40	.36	.23	.41	.36	.33	.39	.27	.13	.35	.10

T.A.s and readers in this program are either poorly chosen or poorly trained and supervised. [col. 25] [F-prob. = .016]

	MUSIC	ART	*ARTHIS	HIST	MISC* HUMANS	FRENCH	GERMAN	SPAN*	TOTAL* HUMANS	Misc* SocSci	*PreHlt
S/Disagree	81%	63%	59%	70%	55%	69%	100%	39%	63%	62%	71%
In Between	11	25	21	15	10	23	0	30	18	28	22
S/Agree	7	13	21	15	35	8	0	30	19	10	8
N	27**	16**	63	33	31	13**	8**	23**	214	39	412

Learning

I will remember a lot of what I have learned in the program's courses for a long time to come. [col. 50] [F-prob. = .000]

	MUSIC	ART	*ARTHIS	HIST	MISC* HUMANS	FRENCH	GERMAN	SPAN*	TOTAL* HUMANS	Misc* SocSci	*PreHlt
S/Disagree	6%	24%	13%	24%	3%	12%	20%	38%	18%	16%	15%
In Between	15	12	18	12	18	38	20	29	20	21	24
S/Agree	79	64	69	64	79	50	60	33	62	63	62
N	33	25	62	33	33	26	10	45	267	38	425
*Mean	4.09	3.60	3.89	3.52	4.18	3.65	3.40	2.91	3.67	3.55	3.62
95% ±	.31	.57	.28	.44	.30	.41	.84	.34	.14	.31	.10

I have been impressed by the caliber or motivation of the other students in this major. [col. 61] [F-prob. = .000]

	MUSIC	ART	*ARTHIS	HIST	MISC* HUMANS	FRENCH	GERMAN	SPAN*	TOTAL* HUMANS	Misc* SocSci	*PreHlt
S/Disagree	18%	40%	19%	9%	21%	27%	11%	51%	25%	32%	12%
In Between	21	28	24	16	32	46	33	22	26	26	30
S/Agree	62	32	56	75	47	27	56	27	48	42	58
N	34	25	62	32	34	26	9	41	263	38	414
*Mean	3.62	2.80	3.65	3.69	3.38	3.04	3.44	2.51	3.29	3.16	3.63
95% ±	.43	.56	.30	.34	.39	.39	.87	.38	.15	.34	.10

*Please see "Description of Samples," especially regarding ARTHIS, MISC HUMANS, SPAN, TOTAL HUMANS, Misc SocSci, and PreHlt. F-tests exclude Misc SocSci and PreHlt, and are based on the original metric, as are means, i.e., 1 = Strongly Disagree, 2 = Disagree . . . 5 = Strongly Agree.

**Percentage of "No Information or Not Applicable" and blank responses is 25% or more.

A plurality of the humanities students (48%) agreed that they were impressed by the caliber or motivation of their fellow majors; 25% disagreed. In Spanish, Art, and French, however, disagreement equalled or exceeded agreement, such that one might wonder if motivation in these programs had been undermined, if students are more judgmental of their fellows because of differing curricular options pursued or different drummers marched to, or if rigor or quality is underdefined.

FACULTY

See also: "Students' Goals and the Program's Contribution Thereto," "Teaching," "Interpretation of Content," "Competition, Workload, Grading, Testing," etc.

Sex and Ethnicity

Students generally disagreed (56%) that there are enough women faculty* in their program; 31% agreed. The only clear exception was French, where 69% agreed. The shortage of women faculty seemed most keenly felt in Spanish (81% disagree) and the Miscellaneous Humanities grouping (69% disagree).

An insufficiency in the number of ethnic minority faculty was more clearly seen (66% agree) than was the case with women faculty, but nonapplicable responses approached a quarter of the sample (23%). Only 18% agreed that there were enough minority faculty, and even where students seemed least to feel an insufficiency (Spanish), 37% agreed while 51% disagreed.

Informal Relations with Students

About twice as many students disagreed (45%) as agreed (22%) that faculty members in their program aren't really interested in or concerned about undergraduates, but almost a third (32%) also chose the "in between" category as well. Considering the scope and strength of this proposition, students seem to be indicating that faculty disinterest in undergraduates is fairly substantial. However, there were also meaningful differences between programs. A lack of real faculty interest and concern seemed least to be a problem in French (63% disagree), the Miscellaneous Humanities grouping (68% disagree) and History (60% disagree), and was most perceived to be descriptive of faculty in Spanish (30% disagree), Art History (30% disagree) and German (38% disagree). In the departments where faculty interest in undergraduates was lowest, roughly the same percentage of students agreed (35%, 34%, and 38%, respectively) as disagreed.

Two-fifths (40%) of the humanities students agreed that communication between faculty and students in their program is "open and fairly extensive,"

*"Faculty" are probably interpreted by most students to include all instructors who are not specifically identified as teaching assistants (or equivalent), particularly in view of students' limited knowledge of their departments (see "Student Participation" below).

FACULTY

N.B.: See also "Students' Goals and the Program's Contribution Thereto," "Teaching," "Interpretation of Content," "Competition, Workload, Grading, Testing," etc.

Sex and Ethnicity

There are enough women faculty in this program. [col. 28] [F-prob. = .000]

	MUSIC	ART	*ARTHIS	HIST	MISC* HUMANS	FRENCH	GERMAN	SPAN*	TOTAL* HUMANS	Misc* SocSci	* PreHlt
S/Disagree	47%	62%	60%	44%	69%	12%	50%	81%	56%	67%	50%
In Between	12	8	7	33	17	19	20	7	14%	14	18
S/Agree	41	31	33	22	14	69	30	12	31	19	32
N	34	26	57	27	29	26	10	42	251	36	360
*Mean	2.82	2.50	2.63	2.67	2.07	3.62	2.80	1.88	2.57	2.14	2.67
95% ±	.53	.50	.41	.50	.44	.36	1.06	.35	.17	.44	.14

There are enough ethnic minority faculty in this program. [col. 29] [F-prob. = .036]

	MUSIC	ART	*ARTHIS	HIST	MISC* HUMANS	FRENCH	GERMAN	SPAN*	TOTAL* HUMANS	Misc* SocSci	* PreHlt
S/Disagree	73%	74%	67%	46%	88%	80%	50%	51%	66%	76%	58%
In Between	15	22	10	38	8	7	25	12	16	3	24
S/Agree	12	4	22	17	4	13	25	37	18	21	19
N	33	23	49	24**	26	15**	8**	41	219	33	331

Informal Relations with Students

Faculty members in this program aren't really interested in or concerned about undergraduates. [col. 18] [F-prob. = .000]

	MUSIC	ART	*ARTHIS	HIST	MISC* HUMANS	FRENCH	GERMAN	SPAN*	TOTAL* HUMANS	Misc* SocSci	* PreHlt
S/Disagree	46%	46%	30%	60%	68%	63%	38%	30%	45%	38%	48%
In Between	35	31	36	29	24	38	23	35	32	26	31
S/Agree	19	23	34	11	9	0	38	35	22	36	21
N	37	26	61	35	34	24	13	43	273	39	418
*Mean	2.65	2.77	3.08	2.34	2.21	2.21	3.00	3.12	2.71	3.05	2.64
95% ±	.38	.43	.29	.37	.34	.30	.82	.33	.13	.41	.10

Communication between faculty and students in this program is open and fairly extensive. [col. 17] [F-prob. = .000]

	MUSIC	ART	*ARTHIS	HIST	MISC* HUMANS	FRENCH	GERMAN	SPAN*	TOTAL* HUMANS	Misc* SocSci	* PreHlt
S/Disagree	27%	23%	35%	14%	12%	17%	23%	55%	28%	32%	26%
In Between	35	35	44	14	35	29	23	25	32	37	29
S/Agree	38	42	21	71	53	54	54	20	40	32	45
N	37	26	62	35	34	24	13	44	275	38	423
*Mean	3.11	3.27	2.76	3.86	3.50	3.58	3.54	2.59	3.17	2.97	3.28
95% ±	.36	.42	.25	.37	.32	.48	.80	.37	.14	.39	.10

At least one professor in this program knows me or my work well enough to write me a good recommendation for graduate school or a job. [col. 19] [F-prob. = .091]

	MUSIC	ART	*ARTHIS	HIST	MISC* HUMANS	FRENCH	GERMAN	SPAN*	TOTAL* HUMANS	Misc* SocSci	* PreHlt
S/Disagree	26%	31%	50%	35%	39%	33%	58%	24%	36%	54%	49%
In Between	13	19	8	9	3	17	0	7	9	13	11
S/Agree	61	50	42	56	58	50	42	69	54	33	41
N	38	26	62	34	33	34	12	45	274	39	423

*Please see "Description of Samples," especially regarding ARTHIS, MISC HUMANS, SPAN, TOTAL HUMANS, Misc SocSci, and PreHlt. F-tests exclude Misc SocSci and PreHlt, and are based on the original metric, as are means, i.e., 1 = Strongly Disagree, 2 = Disagree . . . 5 = Strongly Agree.

**Percentage of "No Information or Not Applicable" and blank responses is 25% or more.

and 28% disagreed (leaving a 32% middle group). Spanish students rated communication lowest (55% disagree), with Art History students not far behind (35% disagree, 44% "in between"). While History got the most positive ratings (71% agree), communication between faculty and students was also seen as more open and extensive in French (54% agree), German (54% agree), and the Miscellaneous Humanities grouping (53% agree).

A majority of the humanities students (54%) thought that at least one professor in their program knew them or their work well enough to write them a good letter of recommendation, and humanities students were in closer contact with faculty in this regard than the students in the life-related or social sciences. Differences between humanities programs were near the borderline of significance, but all apparent differences should be regarded with caution because no study was made to determine the possible influence due to student length-of-time with their program.

Most students (55%) who needed further explanation or extra instruction in the coursework in their major didn't find help or a referral difficult to obtain. (Only 71% of the students gave applicable responses here.) Nineteen percent (19%) agreed that help or a referral did not seem easy to obtain. There were no significant differences between program ratings.

Receptivity to Males, Females, Whites, Minorities

While the questionnaire item may be at fault for drawing 83% of the humanities students to the same response category ("neither more nor less"), there may be a certain reality to this denial that faculty in the various programs are either more, or less, supportive of and receptive to male students as contrasted with female. Students did raise some questions about faculty fairness in Music, however, as 38% saw faculty as more supportive of men (and only 62% said "neither more nor less").

Similar results were obtained concerning white versus ethnic minority students, where 83% again chose the "neither more nor less" response. In Music, however, 31% of the students saw faculty as favoring whites (and the other 69% chose "neither more nor less"). And in Spanish, only 59% chose the category "neither more nor less," but 30% saw faculty as more supportive of whites and 11% saw them as more supportive of minorities, indicating at least some general sensitivity concerning the issue (but no clear consensus).

INFORMATION AND ADVISING SYSTEMS

See also: "Informal Relations with Students."

Program office staff, often the first point of contact for the student, were rated as generally quite helpful by a majority of the respondents in every humanities program, and 76% of the students overall. Eleven percent (11%) disagreed. Students in Art saw their program staff as a little less generally helpful (58% agreed) and students in History gave the most outstanding ratings to staff there (91% agreed).

I have needed further explanation or extra instruction in courses in my major, but help or a referral did not seem easy to obtain. [col. 26] [F-prob. = .162]

	MUSIC	ART	*ARTHIS	HIST	MISC* HUMANS	FRENCH	GERMAN	SPAN*	TOTAL* HUMANS	Misc* SocSci	*PreHlt
S/Disagree	46%	47%	61%	67%	63%	59%	56%	34%	55%	63%	62%
In Between	36	29	22	25	17	29	22	31	26	25	21
S/Agree	18	24	16	8	20	12	22	34	19	13	17
N	28**	17**	49	24**	30	17**	9**	29**	203**	24**	345

Receptivity to Males, Females, Whites, Minorities

Generally speaking, faculty in this program seem to be [fill in] supportive of and receptive to male than female students. [col. 31] [Chi-sq. prob. = .030][a]

	MUSIC	ART	*ARTHIS	HIST	MISC* HUMANS	FRENCH	GERMAN	SPAN*	TOTAL* HUMANS	Misc* SocSci	*PreHlt[a]
Much/More	38%	14%	13%	17%	3%	5%	8%	11%	15%	19%	9%
Neither M/L	62	77	85	83	97	95	92	80	83	78	85
Much/Less	0	9	2	0	0	0	0	9	3	3	5
N	34	22	54	30	31	21	12	35**	239	32	326[a]

Generally speaking, faculty in this program seem to be [fill in] supportive of and receptive to white than minority students. [col. 32] [Chi-sq. prob. = .000][a]

	MUSIC	ART	*ARTHIS	HIST	MISC* HUMANS	FRENCH	GERMAN	SPAN*	TOTAL* HUMANS	Misc* SocSci	*PreHlt[a]
Much/More	31%	15%	9%	4%	11%	0%	0%	30%	15%	15%	9%
Neither M/L	69	85	89	96	89	100	100	59	83	85	88
Much/Less	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	11	2	0	3
N	29	20	46**	23**	27	17**	7**	37	206**	27**	286**[a]

INFORMATION AND ADVISING SYSTEMS

N.B.: See also "Informal Relations with Students."

The program's office staff are generally quite helpful. [col. 59] [F-prob. = .001]

	MUSIC	ART	*ARTHIS	HIST	MISC* HUMANS	FRENCH	GERMAN	SPAN*	TOTAL* HUMANS	Misc* SocSci	*PreHlt
S/Disagree	6%	23%	13%	3%	14%	4%	18%	9%	11%	13%	11%
In Between	18	19	5	6	18	12	9	21	13	26	14
S/Agree	76	58	83	91	68	85	73	70	76	61	76
N	33	26	63	33	34	26	11	43	269	38	416
*Mean	3.97	3.23	4.08	4.52	3.71	4.08	3.55	3.98	3.95	3.61	3.91
95% ±	.37	.43	.27	.27	.44	.36	.76	.33	.13	.37	.10

The program provides a good general orientation for students new to the major. [col. 33] [F-prob. = .359]

	MUSIC	ART	*ARTHIS	HIST	MISC* HUMANS	FRENCH	GERMAN	SPAN*	TOTAL* HUMANS	Misc* SocSci	*PreHlt
S/Disagree	44%	30%	46%	24%	38%	36%	56%	62%	43%	35%	39%
In Between	29	26	21	36	17	28	22	17	24	22	25
S/Agree	26	43	33	40	45	36	22	21	33	43	35
N	34	23	52	25**	29	25	9**	42	239	37	401

*Please see "Description of Samples," especially regarding ARTHIS, MISC HUMANS, SPAN, TOTAL HUMANS, Misc SocSci, and PreHlt. F-tests exclude Misc SocSci and PreHlt, and are based on the original metric, as are means, i.e., 1 = Strongly Disagree, 2 = Disagree . . . 5 = Strongly Agree.

**Percentage of "No Information or Not Applicable" and blank responses is 25% or more.

[a]In these two tables, the PreHlt sample excludes a Misc. Physical Sciences subsample (N = 40) and includes students in Public Health (N = 7) and Health Arts and Sciences (N = 4). The applicability to these particular distributions of the Chi-square probability (measure), which as usual applies only to the Humanities subsamples (plus Italian at N = 6), was not checked by the analyst. The original response categories are: 1 = Much More, 2 = More, 3 = Neither More Nor Less, 4 = Less, 5 = Much Less.

The programs' orientation procedures for students new to the majors were not particularly successful. Overall, 43% of the humanities students disagreed that their program provides a "good general orientation," and 33% agreed. The modest differences between program ratings were not statistically significant.

A plurality of the humanities respondents agreed (45%) that their program's information and advising system(s) makes it easy for them to choose courses and professors in order best to meet their academic needs, and 30% disagreed. Differences between program ratings were of borderline significance, but German (and possibly Art and Music) seemed to have less effective means of course/professor advising, while French and History seemed more highly rated.

Provision of enough information about graduate and professional schools to which students might wish to apply was also weak in these humanities programs (and apparently stronger in the life-related and social sciences). In the humanities, 43% disagreed that enough graduate/professional school information was provided, and 28% agreed. Differences between humanities programs were modest (ranging from 30 to 59% disagreement).

Information provided by the program or faculty about career opportunities for students with a bachelor's degree was particularly deficient in these humanities programs. Overall, 68% of the majors disagreed that enough information on careers was provided, and 16% agreed. A majority of students in every program disagreed, but German, Spanish, and the Miscellaneous Humanities grouping (with 52-56% disagreement) seemed to provide students with better information than did Music (87% disagree).

Choice of Faculty Advisors

As a whole, 95% of the humanities respondents agreed that it would be (or is) valuable to have a regular faculty advisor of their choice in their program. However, overall, only a small percentage agreed (16%) that they had a regular faculty advisor of their choice in their program — and 78% disagreed. The humanities were rated lower than the life-related and social sciences in this regard. In every humanities subsample, a majority of students disagreed, but access to a faculty advisor of the student's choice seemed greatest in the Miscellaneous Humanities grouping of majors (42% agree) and in History (35% agree), and least in German (92% disagree), Spanish (93% disagree), Art History (88% disagree), and Music (89% disagree).

STUDENT PARTICIPATION

A large majority (75%) of the humanities students thought that their program should include undergraduates on most committees and use various other means to help facilitate the organization of undergraduates. A tenth (10%) disagreed. Differences between views of students in the various major programs were small. A minimum necessary element for organization — whether students have ever been notified of a general meeting of undergraduates in

The program's system of information and advising (faculty, secretaries, catalogs, etc.) makes it easy for me to choose courses, professors, and to understand how best to meet my academic needs. [col. 15][F-prob. = .013]

	MUSIC	ART	*ARTHIS	HIST	MISC* HUMANS	FRENCH	GERMAN	SPAN*	TOTAL* HUMANS	Misc* SocSci	*PreHlt
S/Disagree	38%	38%	25%	20%	32%	12%	54%	35%	30%	41%	28%
In Between	27	27	33	20	12	23	23	28	25	15	25
S/Agree	35	35	41	60	56	65	23	37	45	44	47
N	37	26	63	35	34	26	13	46	280	39	426
*Mean	2.89	2.85	3.21	3.60	3.41	3.65	2.62	3.00	3.19	2.97	3.27
95% ±	.43	.51	.27	.41	.45	.39	.84	.34	.14	.40	.11

The faculty and program provide enough information about graduate and professional school programs to which I might want to apply. [col. 14] [F-prob. = .161]

	MUSIC	ART	*ARTHIS	HIST	MISC* HUMANS	FRENCH	GERMAN	SPAN*	TOTAL* HUMANS	Misc* SocSci	*PreHlt
S/Disagree	53%	59%	45%	35%	43%	30%	30%	40%	43%	36%	31%
In Between	25	32	27	19	21	35	40	35	28	28	34
S/Agree	22	9	27	46	36	35	30	25	28	36	35
N	32	22	55	26**	28	23	10	40	236	36	390

The faculty and program provide enough information about career opportunities for students with a Bachelor's degree in this major. [col. 13] [F-prob. = .024]

	MUSIC	ART	*ARTHIS	HIST	MISC* HUMANS	FRENCH	GERMAN	SPAN*	TOTAL* HUMANS	Misc* SocSci	*PreHlt
S/Disagree	87%	73%	75%	68%	52%	70%	56%	54%	68%	59%	54%
In Between	6	23	13	12	19	22	22	22	16	16	23
S/Agree	6	5	13	20	30	9	22	24	16	24	22
N	31	22	55	25**	27	23	9**	41	233	37	396
*Mean	1.68	1.82	2.07	2.32	2.52	2.13	2.56	2.51	2.18	2.49	2.53
95% ±	.36	.42	.29	.47	.54	.40	.78	.40	.15	.37	.11

Choice of Faculty Advisors

Students have a regular faculty advisor of their choice in this program. [col. 16] [F-prob. = .000]

	MUSIC	ART	*ARTHIS	HIST	MISC* HUMANS	FRENCH	GERMAN	SPAN*	TOTAL* HUMANS	Misc* SocSci	*PreHlt
S/Disagree	89%	73%	88%	58%	52%	67%	92%	93%	78%	60%	72%
In Between	3	18	7	8	6	4	0	5	6	9	9
S/Agree	9	9	5	35	42	29	8	2	16	31	19
N	35	22	58	26**	33	24	12	43	253	35	405
*Mean	1.71	2.00	1.62	2.73	2.64	2.33	1.50	1.53	1.96	2.49	2.15
95% ±	.31	.49	.25	.53	.57	.67	.57	.25	.15	.50	.13

It would be (is) valuable to have a regular faculty advisor of my choice. [col. 60] [F-prob. not requested]

	MUSIC	ART	*ARTHIS	HIST	MISC* HUMANS	FRENCH	GERMAN	SPAN*	TOTAL* HUMANS	Misc* SocSci	*PreHlt
S/Disagree	0%	4%	3%	0%	3%	4%	10%	0%	2%	8%	4%
In Between	13	12	6	14	6	0	20	5	8	11	14
S/Agree	87	84	91	86	91	96	70	95	90	81	81
N	32	25	64	29	33	26	10	44	263	36	411

*Please see "Description of Samples," especially regarding ARTHIS, MISC HUMANS, SPAN, TOTAL HUMANS, Misc SocSci, and PreHlt. F-tests exclude Misc SocSci and PreHlt, and are based on the original metric, as are means, i.e., 1 = Strongly Disagree, 2 = Disagree . . . 5 = Strongly Agree.

**Percentage of "No Information or Not Applicable" and blank responses is 25% or more.

their program* — was indicated as having occurred for 60% of the students, but not for another 30%. Most students in History (70%) and in Music (62%) indicated that they had never been notified of such a meeting.

Only a small percentage of students reported that they have been an active member of a student organization, served in a formal governance role, or been otherwise consulted to provide student input to their program. Overall, 77% disagreed and 16% agreed. Involvement was higher in Art, Art History, and Spanish (67-70% disagree) than in Music (96% disagree). In parallel, most humanities respondents disagreed (81%) that they knew a lot about the decision-making, processes, policies, and governance in their program, and only 5% agreed. Differences between program ratings were small.

A plurality of humanities students (43%) did not trust their faculty to take student needs and views into account in decision-making for the program. Thirty percent (30%) did trust the faculty in this regard. There were only minor differences between the levels of trust in the humanities programs. Students' confidence that faculty would take student needs and views into account in making decisions in their programs was highest in the life-related sciences, intermediate in the humanities, and lowest in the Miscellaneous Social Sciences grouping.

Teaching Evaluation

A large majority of the humanities respondents (68%) reported that at least one form for student evaluation of teaching was distributed in each of the program's courses in which they were enrolled last quarter (mostly Fall 1976). Seventeen percent (17%) disagreed. More questions were raised about the universality of student evaluations of teaching in Music (39% disagre) and Spanish (35% disagree) than in most other programs.

Humanities students by a considerable margin agreed (79%) that all faculty should occasionally use the Primer questionnaire to evaluate large or required courses, so that students will have access to evaluations of faculty teaching. Although agreement was a little lower than average in Music (61%) and Art (62%), strong to vast majorities in all the humanities programs surveyed agreed with this proposition. Overall, only 7% disagreed.

OVERALL SATISFACTION

See also: The item, "I will remember a lot of what I have learned in the program's courses for a long time to come" (under "Teaching/Learning").

Using a 7-point scale, the ARU questionnaire asked the students to rate their "overall level of satisfaction" with their major, including "faculty, teaching, advising, courses/curriculum, governance, etc." Across the entire humanities sample, 58% of the students rated their satisfaction on the high

*Dean/Provost Park has for two years consecutively sent out a memo urging departments to call an organizational meeting of their undergraduate majors early in the Fall Quarter.

STUDENT PARTICIPATION

The program should include undergraduates on most committees, provide an office, allow a quarterly mailing, etc., to facilitate undergraduate organization. [col. 53][F-prob. = .245]

	MUSIC	ART	*ARTHIS	HIST	MISC* HUMANS	FRENCH	GERMAN	SPAN*	TOTAL* HUMANS	Misc* SocSci	*PreHlt
S/Disagree	14%	5%	7%	13%	13%	9%	17%	12%	10%	11%	9%
In Between	21	18	11	19	13	5	33	15	15	5	19
S/Agree	66	77	82	68	74	86	50	73	75	84	72
N	29	22	61	31	31	22	6**	41	243	37	377

I have never been notified of a meeting of a general undergraduate organization in this program. [col. 51] [F-prob. = .000]

	MUSIC	ART	*ARTHIS	HIST	MISC* HUMANS	FRENCH	GERMAN	SPAN*	TOTAL* HUMANS	Misc* SocSci	*PreHlt
S/Disagree	38%	70%	83%	21%	70%	54%	50%	67%	60%	69%	46%
In Between	0	9	6	9	6	12	20	19	9	3	8
S/Agree	62	22	11	70	24	35	30	14	30	28	46
N	29	23	63	33	33	26	10	43	260	39	411
*Mean	3.52	2.39	2.03	3.76	2.42	2.77	2.80	2.26	2.64	2.36	3.05
95% ±	.60	.53	.27	.44	.44	.56	.88	.36	.13	.48	.15

I have been an active member of a student organization, served on a departmental committee, attended a faculty meeting, or have been directly consulted to provide student input to this program. [col. 52] [F-prob. = .016]

	MUSIC	ART	*ARTHIS	HIST	MISC* HUMANS	FRENCH	GERMAN	SPAN*	TOTAL* HUMANS	Misc* SocSci	*PreHlt
S/Disagree	96%	67%	69%	85%	77%	80%	86%	70%	77%	76%	85%
In Between	4	10	7	6	7	5	0	13	7	13	7
S/Agree	0	24	24	9	17	15	14	18	16	11	8
N	28**	21	58	33	30	20	7**	40	237	38	390
*Mean	1.43	2.52	2.33	1.76	1.93	1.95	2.00	2.20	2.05	1.82	1.79
95% ±	.22	.55	.35	.37	.48	.62	.92	.38	.15	.34	.10

I know a lot about the decision-making processes, policies, and governance in the program. [col. 54] [F-prob. = .185]

	MUSIC	ART	*ARTHIS	HIST	MISC* HUMANS	FRENCH	GERMAN	SPAN*	TOTAL* HUMANS	Misc* SocSci	*PreHlt
S/Disagree	78%	78%	89%	74%	84%	88%	100%	71%	81%	77%	85%
In Between	19	9	6	26	13	4	0	22	13	20	10
S/Agree	3	13	5	0	3	8	0	7	5	3	5
N	32	23	62	31	31	25	9**	41	254	35	406

I trust the faculty to take student needs and views into account in their decision-making for the program. [col. 55] [F-prob. = .485]

	MUSIC	ART	*ARTHIS	HIST	MISC* HUMANS	FRENCH	GERMAN	SPAN*	TOTAL* HUMANS	Misc* SocSci	*PreHlt
S/Disagree	42%	23%	46%	34%	38%	46%	40%	56%	43%	62%	28%
In Between	27	45	25	34	28	31	20	18	28	22	35
S/Agree	30	32	30	31	34	23	40	27	30	16	36
N	33	22	61	32	32	26	10	45	261	37	413

Teaching Evaluation

At least one form for student evaluation of teaching was distributed last quarter in each of the program's courses in which I was enrolled. [col. 56] [Chi-sq. prob. = .000][a]

	MUSIC	ART	*ARTHIS	HIST	MISC* HUMANS	FRENCH	GERMAN	SPAN*	TOTAL* HUMANS	Misc* SocSci	*PreHlt
S/Disagree	39%	12%	5%	21%	9%	4%	11%	35%	17%	27%	6%
In Between	9	4	2	9	3	0	11	7	5	0	1
S/Agree	52	85	94	70	88	96	78	58	78	73	92
N	33	26	63	33	33	25	9**	43	265	37	420

*Please see "Description of Samples," especially regarding ARTHIS, MISC HUMANS, SPAN, TOTAL HUMANS, Misc SocSci, and PreHlt. F-tests exclude Misc SocSci and PreHlt, and are based on the original metric, as are means, i.e., 1 = Strongly Disagree, 2 = Disagree . . . 5 = Strongly Agree.

**Percentage of "No Information or Not Applicable" and blank responses is 25% or more.

[a]F-test not requested. The Chi-square test as usual applies only to the Humanities subsamples (plus Italian at N = 6).

All faculty should occasionally use the ASU? Primer questionnaire to evaluate their larger courses and those required for the major, so that students will have access to evaluations of faculty teaching. [col. 57][F-prob. = .002]

	MUSIC	ART	*ARTHIS	HIST	MISC* HUMANS	FRENCH	GERMAN	SPAN*	TOTAL* HUMANS	Misc* SocSci	* PreHlt
S/Disagree	14%	19%	4%	3%	6%	0%	22%	3%	7%	8%	7%
In Between	25	19	9	17	23	13	0	8	14	5	15
S/Agree	61	62	88	80	71	87	78	89	79	87	79
N	28**	21	56	30	31	23	9**	38	236	38	409
*Mean	3.54	3.62	4.20	4.10	3.97	4.22	4.11	4.47	4.07	4.18	3.99
95% ±	.37	.58	.22	.30	.37	.29	.98	.28	.12	.37	.09

OVERALL SATISFACTION

N.B.: See also "I will remember a lot of what I have learned in the program's courses for a long time to come" (under "TEACHING" and "Learning").

Please rate your overall level of satisfaction with your major program (faculty, teaching, advising, courses/curriculum, governance, etc.). [col. 74] [F-prob. = .000]

	MUSIC	ART	*ARTHIS	HIST	MISC* HUMANS	FRENCH	GERMAN	SPAN*	TOTAL* HUMANS	Misc* SocSci	* PreHlt
Extre. Low	9%	4%	2%	0%	0%	0%	0%	9%	3%	3%	1%
Low	15	24	8	3	6	4	0	22	11	5	6
Modrt. Low	6	12	15	3	3	12	17	20	11	8	10
In Between	9	24	15	12	21	31	33	15	18	33	19
Modr. High	24	20	33	29	26	31	42	28	29	23	34
High	38	16	23	32	32	19	8	7	23	28	25
Extr. High	0	0	5	21	12	4	0	0	6	3	5
N	34	25	61	34	34	26	12	46	272	40	420
*Mean	4.38	3.80	4.57	5.47	5.12	4.62	4.42	3.52	4.48	4.60	4.74
95% ±	.62	.63	.36	.42	.45	.47	.57	.44	.18	.42	.13

*Please see "Description of Samples," especially regarding ARTHIS, MISC HUMANS, SPAN, TOTAL HUMANS, Misc SocSci, and PreHlt. F-tests exclude Misc SocSci and PreHlt, and are based on the original metric, as are means, i.e., 1 = Strongly Disagree, 2 = Disagree . . . 5 = Strongly Agree. (The 7-point scale given above is used for these analyses on the "overall satisfaction" question.)

**Percentage of "No Information or Not Applicable" and blank responses is 25% or more.

side (scale points 5-6-7), 25% were on the low side, and 18% chose "in between." The mean rating suggests that the "average" student view was half way between "in between" and "moderately high." Students were least satisfied in Spanish (35% high) and Art (36% high), and most satisfied in History (82% high) and the Miscellaneous Humanities grouping (70% high). Students in Music tended to be either fairly satisfied or rather clearly dissatisfied.

STUDENTS' GOALS AND THE PROGRAM'S CONTRIBUTION THERETO

We also sought more information about student satisfaction by asking about the importance to students of five typical goals of a college or university education and the extent to which these goals were met by their program ("program contribution").

Across the humanities programs surveyed, the goals of acquiring training in critical thinking and analysis (hereafter "critical thinking") and of obtaining a broad, general, humanistic, or person-centered education (hereafter "a broadly humanistic education") were given the highest ratings of importance by students. The average rating of "importance" for these two goals fell about one-third of the way between "high" and "very high" on a 5-point scale.* The other three goals received average "importance" ratings that fell just below "high." These goals were: preparation for graduate or professional school, preparation for a career, and promoting social responsibility or developing skills useful in the community (hereafter "social responsibility/community skills").

Among the students in the various humanities programs, there were no significant differences in the importance assigned to preparation for graduate or professional school, or to developing social responsibility/community skills. The goal of acquiring training in critical thinking was of somewhat higher than average importance in the Miscellaneous Humanities grouping and possibly in History and Art History as well. A broadly humanistic education was least important in Music and somewhat low in German. Preparation for a career was far less important in German and History than among other students, and it was perhaps most important in Spanish.

Difference Scores

In the table presenting the results of the students' ratings of importance of the five educational goals, we have also presented averages for the ratings of program contribution as well as a "difference score" between the two. Larger difference scores presumably suggest greater deficiencies or areas of effort which might most result in the improvement of undergraduate education in a given program. While there are significant differences in

*The scale consists of: Very High — High — In Between — Low — Very Low.

STUDENTS' GOALS AND THE PROGRAM'S CONTRIBUTION THERETO

Importance of Goals to Students, Program Contribution to Meeting Goals, Difference Scores*

Program	Prep for a Career			Preparation for Grad/Profl School			Broad Humanistic			Critical Thinking			Social Responsib			Five-Item Average N	
	Impt	Dept Met	Diff	Impt	Dept Met	Diff	Impt	Dept Met	Diff	Impt	Dept Met	Diff	Impt	Dept Met	Diff	Impt	Dept Met
MUSIC	3.95	2.65	1.30	3.54	3.67	-.13	3.79	2.58	1.19	4.11	3.73	.38	3.69	2.14	1.55	35.4	34.4
ART	3.96	2.00	1.96	3.60	2.79	.81	4.38	3.16	1.22	4.35	3.00	1.35	4.13	2.33	1.80	25.2	23.8
ARTHIS*	3.90	2.12	1.78	3.75	3.04	.71	4.50	3.39	1.11	4.52	3.83	.69	3.75	1.96	1.79	59.6	57.6
HISTORY	2.97	2.83	.14	3.73	3.59	.14	4.53	3.97	.56	4.56	4.09	.47	3.84	2.72	1.12	33.4	32.4
MISC HUMANS*	3.88	2.65	1.33	3.97	3.45	.52	4.48	3.70	.78	4.74	3.97	.77	3.65	2.27	1.38	33.2	31.4
FRENCH	4.00	2.46	1.54	3.39	3.27	.12	4.46	3.64	.82	4.08	3.36	.72	3.65	2.16	1.49	24.4	22.8
GERMAN	2.92	2.18	.74	3.67	2.82	.85	4.09	3.90	.19	4.25	3.36	.89	3.30	1.78	1.52	11.4	10.4
SPANISH*	4.28	2.61	1.67	3.86	3.10	.76	4.34	2.85	1.49	4.21	2.87	1.34	4.12	2.24	1.88	45.4	43.2
TOTAL HUMANS*	3.83	2.44	1.39	3.71	3.25	.46	4.36	3.33	1.03	4.38	3.58	.80	3.81	2.22	1.59	268.0	256.0
F-prob.	.000	.026		.724	.030		.006	.000		.010	.000		.348	.045			
5- V High	38%	5%		35%	14%		55%	16%		57%	24%		37%	1%			
4- High	28	13		27	33		31	31		29	34		28	8			
3- In Bet	20	30		21	29		10	31		11	24		19	33			
2- Low	9	26		9	13		2	13		2	11		10	30			
1- V Low	6	26		8	12		1	9		1	7		5	29			
SocSci*	4.07	3.05	1.02	4.00	3.33	.67	4.27	3.54	.73	4.54	3.93	.61	4.22	3.22	1.00		
PreHlt*	4.23	3.08	1.15	4.16	3.61	.55	3.96	2.74	1.22	4.27	3.59	.68	3.93	2.59	1.34		

*The original questionnaire item was worded as follows: "To what extent are the following goals important to you, and to what extent has your major program met them?" The students were then asked to rate "Importance to you" and "Program's contribution" for each of the following five goals:

1) Preparation for a career
2) Preparation for graduate or professional school
3) Providing a broad, general, humanistic, or person-centered education
4) Providing training in critical thinking and analysis
5) Promoting social responsibility or developing skills useful in the community

Please note that the "difference scores" are based on students who responded to either or both the "Importance to you" and "Program's contribution" ratings. However, as indicated in the two righthand columns of the table, there are only a few students who did not rate both components of each item.

Please see "Description of Samples," especially regarding ARTHIS, MISC HUMANS, SPAN, TOTAL HUMANS, Misc SocSci, and PreHlt. F-tests exclude Misc SocSci and PreHlt, and are based on the original metric, as are means, i.e., 1 = Very Low, 2 = Low . . . 5 = Very High.

the ratings of program contributions for all five of these student goals, the discussion following will also focus on the difference scores.*

The largest average "deficiencies" (difference scores) and the lowest program contribution ratings were obtained in the goal areas of social responsibility/community skills development and career preparation. Nine percent (9%) of the humanities students viewed program contributions to social responsibility/community skills as high, 59% viewed them as low.** Eighteen percent (18%) saw their program's contribution to career preparation as high, while 52% rated it as low. Thus almost all of the programs sampled could presumably benefit by increasing their efforts or faculty competencies to meet students' educational needs and goals in these areas.

With regard to social responsibility/community skills, although none of the differences between students' ratings of importance and program contribution were small, History, which received the highest rating of program contribution, came closest to meeting student goals in this area. (Spanish, Art, and Art History had slightly higher differentials than the other programs.) Program contribution was rated a little lower in German and Art History than elsewhere.

Regarding career preparation, students in History were apparently largely satisfied.*** There was almost no difference between History students' average rating of "importance" (which was relatively low) and of "program contribution" (which was perhaps highest among the subsamples). German students were also less differentially dissatisfied than most, primarily because of low "importance" ratings. Program contributions were rated lowest in Art, Art History, and German, and the differential between the importance and contribution ratings was highest in the two artistic programs.

The humanities programs received their highest contribution ratings for providing training in critical thinking. The programs' contributions to a broadly humanistic education were also rated fairly high. But since these goals were also of greatest importance to students in the programs surveyed, the differentials between the ratings of importance and program contribution were still moderately large. With respect to critical thinking, 58% rated their program's contribution as high, and 18% rated it as low. Concerning the goal of obtaining a broadly humanistic education, 47% saw their program's contribution as high, and 22% viewed it as low. As the relative weaknesses are reported below, however, the reader should be aware that the highest difference scores in these goal areas would represent differentials of only average magnitude for the first two goals reported above (career preparation and social responsibility/community skills development).

---

*Unfortunately, time constraints prevented us from undertaking a closer statistical analysis of the difference between "importance" and "program contribution" ratings. (Since most respondents rated both measures, however, it was not particularly necessary to discount students who answered only the importance component of the pair.)

**In this text, "Very High" plus "High" have been combined (to "high"), as have "Very Low" and "Low" (to "low"). The percentage of "In Between" responses for the full humanities sample are provided in the table.

***According to an item reported in an earlier table, however, all students want more adequate career-related information.

With that caveat in mind, it is fair to report that the largest differences between importance and contribution ratings on "critical thinking" were found in Art and Spanish, where program contributions were rated as lowest. (French and German were also rated relatively low in contribution.) History, the Miscellaneous Humanities grouping, Art History, and Music received the highest ratings for contributing to training in critical thinking. The lowest differentials (greatest satisfaction perhaps) were found in Music and History, the latter despite the fairly high importance ratings assigned by students to "critical thinking."

With respect to a broadly humanistic education, students in Spanish, Art, Music, and Art History seemed to have the greatest unmet needs (largest differential). Program contribution ratings were lowest in Music and Spanish. History and German received the highest ratings for program contribution, and students in German appeared very nearly satisfied with their program's level of contribution to a broadly humanistic education. (German students' "importance" ratings were a little low.)

Finally, since differences between the students' importance and program contribution ratings were smallest with respect to the goal of preparation for graduate or professional school, the humanities programs were apparently most relatively successful in this regard. Overall, 47% of the students rated their program's contribution as high, and 25% saw it as low.

Judging by the differentials, students in Music, French, and History were pretty much satisfied with their preparation for graduate or professional school. And while the magnitude of the differences is only modest, students in German, Art, Spanish, and Art History appear to be somewhat less satisfied (and program contributions were rated a little lower in these four departments as well).

Summary of Program Contributions

Considering each of the five goals as equal in value, and averaging the difference scores between the "importance" and "program contribution" ratings by the students enrolled, one gets the picture that student satisfaction is lowest in Art, Spanish (where expectations/importance ratings are somewhat high), and Art History. By this same measure, satisfaction clearly seems higher in History. These results correspond fairly closely to those obtained on the item about students' "overall satisfaction" with their program.